

As in legislative session, I now move that the Senate adjourn until Thursday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 4 o'clock and 28 minutes p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 12 o'clock meridian.

CONFIRMATIONS

Executive nominations confirmed by the Senate November 16 (legislative day of November 12), 1943:

UNITED STATES PUBLIC HEALTH SERVICE PROMOTIONS FOR TEMPORARY SERVICE

To be temporary passed assistant surgeons

Philip H. Best William C. Jenkins, Jr.
John G. Crawford Harry J. Schweigert
Mayo L. Emory

To be temporary surgeon

Frederick J. Krueger

To be temporary sanitary engineer

Gordon E. McCallum

To be temporary senior surgeons

William Hendon Robert H. Flinn
Gordon Frederick W. Kratz
Leonard A. Scheele

IN THE NAVY

TEMPORARY SERVICE

Lynde D. McCormick to be rear admiral in the Navy, to rank from July 15, 1942.

Clarence E. Olsen to be rear admiral in the Navy, while serving as the United States naval member on a military mission to the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, of which Maj. Gen. John R. Deane, United States Army, is the head, to rank from November 10, 1943.

William H. Hamilton to be commodore in the Navy, while serving as commander, Fleet Air Wing 7, Atlantic Fleet, and assigned to duty in the United Kingdom, to rank from November 10, 1943.

APPOINTMENT IN THE MARINE CORPS

TO BE SECOND LIEUTENANTS

Clarence C. Moore, Jr.
Robert M. Jenkins
William H. Frey

POSTMASTERS

MASSACHUSETTS

Anne S. Drake, Cummington.
Bertha T. Conners, East Templeton.
Rosanna T. Ruel, Granby.
Marjorie C. Purdy, Marshfield Hills.
Margaret R. Brewster, Randolph.
Jennie A. Consoni, Sagamore.

NORTH DAKOTA

Marie A. Hanson, Aneta.

OHIO

Walter E. Cole, Andover.
Eugene D. Morris, Clarksburg.
Sarah Griffith, Pedro.
Janet M. Wilson, Ridgeway.
Tressie U. Kerr, Sullivan.

TENNESSEE

Maben B. Curry, Henry.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

TUESDAY, NOVEMBER 16, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Thou blessed and ever-living Lord, let Thy spirit steal into every heart that the humblest duty may be glorified. As we wait in Thy presence these sacred mo-

ments, hearken, our Father, unto us. Grant that this day we may resolve not to live for our own aims and advancement, but to bear loss willingly and labor zealously that our people may see the way that leads to a just and a contented national life.

Grant us a fuller measure of awareness that position may not revolve about self. Give us Thy counsel when in need and remind us of the great obligation we owe our country. To this end we pray for the fellowship of a single purpose and for a spirit to share our common tasks. O Knight of God, with Thine undaunted heart, challenge us to walk about Zion that we may tell it to the generations to come: This God is our God and will be our guide even unto death. O let not the deathless liberties of our free institutions lose their power and meaning in the dusty deadness of selfishness. Do Thou put Thy spirit into all breasts that our citizens may be drawn to the altar of re consecration; then the breaking light will soon open on the dawn and glory be unto Thine excellent name, O Master, forever. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Frazier, its legislative clerk, announced that the Senate had passed without amendment a concurrent resolution of the House of the following title:

H. Con. Res. 53. Concurrent resolution authorizing the printing of additional copies of the hearings held before the Committee on Ways and Means of the House of Representatives, current session, on the bills (H. R. 2324, H. R. 2698, and H. R. 3015) to amend the Sixth Supplemental National Defense Appropriation Act of 1942, as amended.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the amendment of the House to a joint resolution of the Senate of the following title:

S. J. Res. 59. Joint resolution authorizing the President of the United States of America to proclaim Armed Services Honor Day for the recognition and appreciation of the patriotic devotion to duty of all members of all branches of the armed military and naval forces of the United States of America.

The message also announced that the Senate agrees to the report of the committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill (H. R. 3363) entitled "An act extending the time within which applications under section 722 of the Internal Revenue Code must be made."

NATIONAL AGRICULTURAL JEFFERSON BICENTENARY COMMITTEE

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that in the engrossment of the amendments to Senate Joint Resolution 47, providing for the appointment of a National Agricultural Jefferson Bicentenary Committee to carry out under the general direction of the United States Commission for the Celebration of the Two Hundredth Anniversary of the Birth of Thomas Jefferson appropriate exercises and activities in recognition of the services and contributions of Thomas

Jefferson to the farmers and the agriculture of the Nation, the Clerk of the House be authorized to include therein an amendment striking out the preamble.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

JOINT MEETING OF HOUSE AND SENATE TO HEAR SECRETARY OF STATE

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the membership I wish to announce that the Secretary of State, the Honorable Cordell Hull, will address a joint meeting of the Senate and the House on Thursday next, November 18, 1943, at 12:30 o'clock p. m.

Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that it may be in order for the Speaker to declare a recess at any time on Thursday next, such recess to be subject to the call of the Chair.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. The Chair desires to make a statement. After consultation with the majority and the minority leaders of the House and remembering the terrific jams we had upon this floor on previous occasions, with the consent and approval of the floor leaders, the Chair announces that on Thursday next the door immediately opposite the Speaker will be open, and the doors on the Speaker's left and right, and none other. No one will be allowed upon the floor who does not have the privilege of the floor of the House.

COMMITTEE ON MILITARY AFFAIRS

Mr. COCHRAN. Mr. Speaker, by direction of the Committee on Accounts I submit a privileged resolution (H. Res. 355), and ask for its immediate consideration.

The Clerk read as follows:

Resolved, That the further expenses of conducting the investigation authorized by House Resolution 30 of the present Congress, incurred by the Committee on Military Affairs, acting as a whole or by subcommittee, not to exceed \$40,000 in addition to sums heretofore made available, including expenditures for the employment of experts, and clerical, stenographic, and other assistants, shall be paid out of the contingent fund of the House on vouchers authorized by such committee, signed by the chairman thereof and approved by the Committee on Accounts.

Sec. 2. The official stenographers to committees may be used at all hearings held in the District of Columbia, unless otherwise officially engaged.

The resolution was agreed to.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. LANE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and to include therein a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. SULLIVAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from the Washington Daily News by Raymond Clapper under date of November 15, 1943, entitled "Food Subsidies."

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. LUTHER A. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein a brief editorial from the Boston Globe on our foreign policy.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include therein an editorial from the Memphis Commercial Appeal.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on tomorrow afternoon, November 17, after the legislative business of the day and the other special orders already entered, I may address the House for 25 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. KINZER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter I received from J. C. Capt. Director of the Bureau of the Census.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. KINZER]?

There was no objection.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and to include a letter from Earl S. Peirce, Acting Administrator, Northeastern Timber Salvage Administration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS]?

There was no objection.

(Mr. KEARNEY asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the Appendix of the RECORD.)

NEW DEAL BUREAUCRATIC DEMAGOGS

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. BREHM]?

There was no objection.

Mr. BREHM. Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] for his very unique talk made last night at the invitation of Fulton Lewis, Jr., over radio station WOL.

Any man who can make such a plea for that vanishing race of New Deal bu-

reaucratic demagogues and stretch his imagination so far as to infer that he is discussing subsidies is, indeed, a super-master in the technique of camouflage, and in this respect his talk was indeed unique.

To dodge the issue and resort to personalities not only denotes weakness but downright feebleness.

ANSWERING FULTON LEWIS, JR.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, if anyone will read the text of Fulton Lewis' radio address complained of he will find he did attack me personally and by name, and, in my opinion, when radio commentators on commercial programs attack anyone personally it is only right that that party get time to reply. The radio company could not give me this time and I filed a complaint with the Federal Communications Commission. I was talking to his manager about the text of Mr. Lewis' speech in which he attacked me and informed him that I expected to have the Federal Communications Commission pass on the question as to whether or not I would be entitled to answer Mr. Lewis on his program. His manager said he would give me the time on Mr. Lewis' program which was what I wanted. I accepted without any reservations or restrictions. I did not presume I would be under obligations to Mr. Lewis by so doing since I was foregoing and giving up a valuable privilege by withdrawing my complaint before the Federal Communications Commission and it is true that to accept the time was the better way to handle it. I am afraid the gentleman who just spoke did not hear the speech, therefore I ask unanimous consent that I may revise and extend my remarks and insert this radio address of mine in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I should like to ask the gentleman from Texas if this is the tirade—

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I object.

The SPEAKER. The Chair may say to the gentlemen when they do things like that they will get the House into a lot of trouble. Objection is heard.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I regret exceedingly to have to object to the gentleman's speaking but I will have to if they will not

let me put my own address in the RECORD.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. Speaker, I did not object.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, I want to assure the gentleman from Texas that we want his speech in the RECORD because it was nothing but a political speech.

The SPEAKER. Objection was heard to the gentleman from Texas publishing the speech.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I have not objected.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Michigan [Mr. CRAWFORD] did.

Mr. CRAWFORD. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, for the information of the gentlemen who are complaining, I ask unanimous consent that the address I made be inserted in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD at this point.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair cannot recognize the gentleman to insert the speech at this point in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, then I ask that it be inserted in the Appendix of the RECORD.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object—

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD]?

There was no objection.

Mr. GIFFORD. Mr. Speaker, I do not object to the radio speech of the gentleman from Texas. I loved it. Why, the country now realizes that the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, and the Republican minority are of some weight and importance in this House of a Democratic majority. It is the most helpful speech to the Republicans we have heard for a long time. I want to say to the gentleman from Texas who has filled the RECORD lately so voluminously on the beauties of subsidies that he may begin to revise his own arguments pretty soon. His own Texas people testified yesterday against subsidies, and rightly named them as blackmail and bribery. Seemingly he should heed the voice of Texas. Is he so determined to salvage the administration that he cannot hear a message from his own beloved Texas? Does not the gentleman realize he is really building up our gentleman from Massachusetts, JOE MARTIN, for greater things?

I personally thank him, and the more he talks subsidies after that manner the better we like it.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. MARTIN of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, first I wish to thank my distinguished friend from Texas for doing me the honor of mentioning me in his broadcast last night. Now, simply for the RECORD, and in order he may at least have and state the truth hereafter, I wish to say that I never had a luncheon with members of the Committee on Banking and Currency; I never asked any member of that committee to change his position.

Any commentator or columnist who says otherwise is not telling the truth.

I believe—and only to keep the RECORD straight—this statement should be made at this time.

MUTUAL'S RADIO PROGRAM

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from South Dakota?

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, some radio history was made last night over the Mutual Broadcasting System, although unfortunately all of it was not good. I think the gentleman from Texas was precisely correct in requesting the Mutual Broadcasting System and Fulton Lewis to grant him permission to speak, as his name had been used on the radio and his statements had been criticized. I congratulate him on his persistency in getting that permission. I congratulate the Mutual Broadcasting System and Fulton Lewis on doing the fair thing and giving him the opportunity. It was exactly the kind of fairness we would expect from Fulton Lewis, as he is generally recognized as the fairest and most accurate news commentator in America.

I think when private citizens or public officials are attacked or criticized on the air they should have the right of rejoinder. I believe that the chairman of the Senate Interstate Commerce Committee is intending to write such a provision into the new radio code.

It is extremely unfortunate, however, that the gentleman from Texas should pervert this opportunity by making a political tirade out of his talk instead of answering Mr. Fulton Lewis as he was advertised to do. However, that should not invalidate the principle that private citizens and public officials should have the right on the air to answer columnists and commentators who attack them in person. Unless some such opportunity is provided freedom of speech on the air becomes a farce instead of a fact.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, whenever anyone attacks the Republican Party, as did the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN], it must be borne in mind that he is attacking the majority of the American people. Our leader, that ardent patriot, the gentleman from Massachusetts, JOSEPH W. MARTIN, Jr., has led the fight against inflationary steps. May I remind the House that for more than 10 years the voice of JOE MARTIN has been raised against the vast delegation of power to the Executive. For 10 years and more his voice has been raised against huge appropriation bills and other measures that create inflation, while all through that time the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] has been ardently working for those things that would bring inflation.

ASHAMED OF THEIR WORK

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, if I were given time on the radio every time Walter Winchell went after me, you would not hear much else.

Last night over the radio the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] told the housewives of America that if, when they went to market, they were required to pay 10 cents more for a pound of ham the Republicans and the Republican leader, JOE MARTIN, would be to blame for the addition to the cost of living.

Throughout his talk, which was remarkable for its inaccuracies and erroneous conclusions, the gentleman sought to divert attention from the mess into which the New Deal, of which he is an ardent supporter, has plunged us.

He ignored the fact that the skyrocketing of the cost of living, the apparent scarcity of the necessities of life, the high and burdensome taxation under which the people are laboring, are all the result of deliberate New Deal planning. "We planned it that way," said the President.

The gentleman from Texas overlooked the fact that, if now we are in a desperate situation requiring extreme remedies, our condition is the result of the New Deal policy which he has so ardently supported for the past 10 years. For 10 years and more the gentleman and his party have been in undisputed control of both branches of Congress, of the executive department, and for the last 2 or 3 years in control of the Supreme Court.

Today his party has a working majority in both the Senate and the House and his confession that chacs and bankruptcy exist, that bribery through subsidies should be practiced, is proof—if proof were needed—of the fallacy of the New Deal policy, the incompetency of New Deal leadership, in which the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is a spokesman and a director.

The gentleman views the structure which he and his party have erected, admits that it is a monstrosity, and attempts to shift responsibility to the Republicans, who bitterly, consistently, and persistently opposed its erection.

MILK SHORTAGE

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. TABER. Mr. Speaker, the subsidy program of the Roosevelt administration has been used so far to cover up the complete failure of the War Food Administration and the Office of Price Administration to increase our food production.

The milk situation is so desperate at this time that unless corn is immediately released to New York, Pennsylvania, New Jersey, and New England within 6 weeks we face the loss of 35 percent of our dairy cattle.

Feed is now being put out with 1 percent corn, 90-percent dust, 2- or 3-percent wheat, oats, and barley. The cow is not being deceived even if the people are. Pretty soon the people will feel the shortage of milk resulting from the subsidy and the failure of the Office of Price Administration and the War Food Administration.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Nebraska?

There was no objection.

Mr. MCKENZIE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a statement I made before a subcommittee of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. WARD. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a speech made by Charles B. Donaldson at Salisbury, Md., on the 11th.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Maryland?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANDOLPH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein certain editorial comment.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from West Virginia?

There was no objection.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial on subsidies.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Georgia?

There was no objection.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. AUGUST H. ANDRESEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a radio speech that I shall make over a broadcasting system tonight.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LAFOLLETTE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an address I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

THE PRIVATE CALENDAR

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will call the first bill on the Private Calendar.

ETHEL COHEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1854) for the relief of Ethel Cohen.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ethel Cohen, of Chicago, Ill., the sum of \$750 in full settlement of all claims against the United States for injuries sustained by her on April 23, 1939, because of negligence of the Works Progress Administration: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LAFAYETTE GIBSON

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1442) for the relief of Lafayette Gibson.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Lafayette Gibson, 451 Oakley Avenue, Columbus, Ohio, the sum of \$850. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Lafayette Gibson against the United States on account of personal injuries sustained on

December 6, 1941, when the automobile which he was driving on North Fourth Street, Columbus, Ohio, was struck by a United States Army truck.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, line 1, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

JOHN SIMS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 399) for the relief of John Sims.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to John Sims, Mobile, Ala., the sum of \$5,000. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by the said John Sims on September 26, 1942, when he was struck while walking on a sidewalk bordering upon Highway No. 45, near Toulminville, Ala., by a truck of the Work Projects Administration, assigned to project WP-6746.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,100", and on page 2, line 2, strike out the period, insert a colon and the following: "*Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PETER A. GAWALIS

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1594) for the relief of Peter A. Gawalis.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Peter A. Gawalis the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries as a result of a collision between the automobile in which he was riding and an Army truck on Highway No. 25, in Linden, N. J., on February 4, 1942: *Provided,* That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAUNDERS MEMORIAL HOSPITAL

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1737) for the relief of the Saunders Memorial Hospital.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Saunders Memorial Hospital, Florence, S. C., the sum of \$37,550. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of losses sustained by such hospital as the result of the failure of the United States Army Engineer Corps to carry out the terms of a lease of such hospital to the United States, for the duration of the present war, and 6 months thereafter.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "out", insert the word "of"; in line 10, after the word "of", strike out the article "a" and insert the words "an option to"; and in line 10, after the word "lease", strike out the word "of."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I offer the following amendment, which I send to the desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. SPRINGER: On page 1, line 6, strike out "\$37,550" and insert "\$25,000."

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

S. I. WOOTEN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 1760) for the relief of S. I. Wooten.

Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

ESTATE OF RALPH ALTON GREENLEAF

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2091) for the relief of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf, Wakefield, Mass., personally, the sum of \$5,000 and to Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf, Wakefield, Mass., administratrix of the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, deceased, the sum of \$10,000. The payment of such sums shall be in full settlement of all claims of Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf and the estate of Ralph Alton Greenleaf on account of personal injuries sustained by Mrs. Gladys M. Greenleaf, the death of her husband, Ralph Alton Greenleaf, resulting from personal injuries, and damage in the amount of \$400 to personal property owned by Ralph Alton Greenleaf, caused by a collision of the automobile of Ralph Alton Greenleaf, in which they were riding, with a United States Army truck on Main Street, Wakefield, Mass., on April 20, 1942:

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 9, strike out the figures "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$5,754."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "in the amount of \$400 to personal property owned by Ralph Alton Greenleaf" and insert in lieu thereof "to automobile and funeral expenses."

At the end of bill strike out the period and insert in lieu thereof: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

NADINE GORMAN

The Clerk called the bill (H. R. 2385) for the relief of Nadine Gorman.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,500 to Nadine Gorman, of Omaha, Nebr., in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for damages for personal injuries and property damage sustained by her when an automobile in the service of the Works Progress Administration ran into her automobile in Omaha, Nebr., on February 2, 1939: *Provided*, That the above sum shall be accepted in full release of the judgment held against Arthur L. Dunn.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out the figures "\$2,500" and insert in lieu thereof the figures "\$1,500."

Page 1, line 6, strike out "her claim" and insert in lieu thereof "all claims."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "for damages."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

TOM S. STEED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2691, for the relief of Tom S. Steed.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the limitations of time in sections 15 to 20, both inclusive, of the act entitled "An act to provide compensation for employees of the United States suffering injuries while in the performance of their duties, and for other purposes," approved September 7, 1916, as amended, are hereby waived in favor of Tom S. Steed, a former employee of the Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Winnsboro, Tex., for disability alleged to have resulted from an injury sustained by him on April 19, 1937, and the United States Employees' Compensation Commission is hereby authorized to consider and determine the merits of his claim under the remaining provisions of said act.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ARVO KARI, LEMPI K. HOLM, AND BURT JOHNSTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2792, for the relief of Arvo Kari, Lempi K. Holm, and Burt Johnston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, (1) to Arvo Kari, of Westport, Wash., the sum of \$2,754.20; (2) to Lempi K. Holm, of Westport, Wash., the sum of \$1,500; and (3) to Burt Johnston, of Westport, Wash., the sum of \$9,910, in full satisfaction of their respective claims against the United States for compensation for the loss of real and personal property owned by them which was destroyed by fire on February 19, 1942, as a result of the negligence of United States Army personnel: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "\$9,910" and insert "\$9,047."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the

third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ESTATE OF JENNIE I. WESTON, DECEASED

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3153, for the relief of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Richard A. Weston, Newark, Ohio, administrator of the estate of Jennie I. Weston, deceased, or his successor in trust, the sum of \$29,360.15. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of such estate against the United States on account of the death of the said Jennie I. Weston and damage to real and personal property owned by her caused by a United States Army bomber on September 8, 1942, when it crashed into her dwelling.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "Richard A. Weston, Newark, Ohio", and insert the word "the."

Page 1, line 7, strike out "or his successor in trust" and strike out "\$29,360.15" and insert "\$19,915."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "of such estate."

Page 2, line 3, strike out "dwelling" and insert "dwellings."

Page 2, line 3, insert *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

J. CLYDE MARQUIS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3194, for the relief of J. Clyde Marquis.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the present consideration of the bill?

Mr. MCGREGOR and Mr. SPRINGER objected, and, under the rule, the bill was recommitted to the Committee on Claims.

W. I. DOOLY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 759, conferring jurisdiction upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That jurisdiction is hereby conferred upon the United States District Court for the Eastern District of Tennessee to hear, determine, and render judgment upon the claim of W. I. Dooly,

of Conasauga, Polk County, Tenn., for compensation for the value of his undivided one-half interest in tract No. 766d, containing 124 $\frac{1}{100}$ acres, in Fannin County, Ga., which was included with other lands acquired by the United States pursuant to condemnation proceedings instituted March 21, 1936 (case No. 1928 at law), in the United States District Court for the Northern District of Georgia, Atlanta division, and in which final judgment was rendered on October 5, 1936.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

EDDIE PERCLE

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 770, for the relief of Eddie Percle.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to Eddie Percle, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of his wife, Mrs. Octavie Landry Percle, when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a Civilian Conservation Corps truck, on June 27, 1940, near Thibodaux, Lafourche Parish, La.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

GRAFTON BOAT WORKS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 862, for the relief of the Grafton Boat Works.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Grafton Boat Works, of Grafton, Ill., the sum of \$240, in full satisfaction of its claim against the United States for compensation for storing a boat belonging to the National Youth Administration during the period from December 1, 1940, to April 1, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MILFORD TRUST CO. ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 950, for the relief of the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to the Milford Trust Co. and Blanche R. Bennett, of Milford, Del., as administrators of the estate of Charles E. Reed, deceased, the sum of \$4,155, in full satisfaction of their claims against the United States for compensation for damage to a farm building and certain machinery and equipment therein, owned by such estate, which resulted when a United States Army airplane crashed into such building on July 18, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ERVIN S. FINLEY

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1246, for the relief of Ervin S. Finley.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ervin S. Finley, of Sumter, S. C., the sum of \$500, in full satisfaction of his claims against the United States for compensation for personal injuries sustained by him when he was struck by a Government-owned truck operated by a civilian employee of the Army Air Corps at Shaw Field, S. C., on September 15, 1942, and for reimbursement of medical and hospital expenses incurred by him as a result of such injuries: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAN AMERICAN AIRWAYS, INC.

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1309, for the relief of Pan American Airways, Inc.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Comptroller General of the United States be, and he hereby is, authorized and directed to settle and adjust the claim of Pan American Airways, Inc., a corporation organized and existing under the laws of the State of New York, for \$2,681.82 as the value of two dry-ice boxes belonging to it which were stored in Honolulu, T. H., and which were received from storage by a representative of the United States Army and placed on board the United States Army transport *Royal T. Frank* in the mistaken belief that they were boxes belonging to the United States Navy which the

Navy had agreed to lend to the Army, and which two boxes belonging to Pan American Airways, Inc., were lost when that vessel was destroyed by enemy submarine action, and to allow in full and final settlement of the claim not to exceed \$2,681.82. There is hereby appropriated out of any moneys in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$2,681.82, or so much thereof as may be necessary, for the payment of the claim: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHRISTINE MANGRUM ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2005, for the relief of Christine Mangrum, Luster Mangrum, and Nathan Mangrum.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Christine Mangrum, of Fairview, Tenn., the sum of \$5,000, and to Luster Mangrum, of Fairview, Tenn., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained, and to Nathan Mangrum, of Fairview, Tenn., the sum of \$800, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property loss sustained, when the truck in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck at the intersection of Lea Avenue and Eighth Avenue South, Nashville, Tenn., on August 5, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$3,500."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "\$800" and insert in lieu thereof "\$50."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

RELIEF OF CERTAIN OFFICERS AND EMPLOYEES OF THE FOREIGN SERVICE OF THE UNITED STATES

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1332, for the relief of certain officers and employees of the Foreign Service of the United States who, while in the course of their respective duties, suffered losses of personal property by reason of war conditions.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That there is authorized to be appropriated, and there is hereby appropriated, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the following sums of money, which sums represent the value of reasonable and necessary personal property lost by the claimants as a result of war conditions:

Theodore C. Achilles, \$5,837.50; Henry E. Stebbins, \$411; Henry M. Wolcott, \$104; William Nicholas Carroll, \$1,707; George K. Donald, \$3,593.50; James G. Carter, \$12,000; Myles Standish, \$900; Sam E. Woods, \$650; Edmund A. Gullion, \$860; Harold D. Clum, \$7,090.15; John H. Lord, \$9,200; Landreth Harrison, \$1,170.25; Isabel Pinard, \$623; Jule B. Smith, \$1,086.42; C. C. M. Pedersen, \$325; Thormod O. Klath, \$275; John K. Davis, \$699.33; Stanley G. Slavens, \$355; Donald W. Lamm, \$270; Frank S. Williams, \$125; Arthur B. Emmons III, \$139; John K. Caldwell, \$792; Gordon L. Burke, \$460; Samuel J. Fletcher, \$933.25; William E. Yuni, \$100; M. R. Rutherford, \$230; David C. Berger, \$220; John B. Sawyer, \$343; Owen L. Dawson, \$343; U. Alexis Johnson, \$898.50; J. Dixon Edwards, \$50; J. Hall Paxton, \$100; Quincy F. Roberts, \$952; Kenneth J. Yearns, \$280; Nathalie D. Boyd, \$1,000; Walter W. Hoffman, \$1,726.56; Fred-eric C. Fornes, Jr., \$3,801.50; John H. Bruins, \$1,938.45; Addison E. Southard, \$3,015; Clarence E. Gauss, \$447; Kingsley W. Hamilton, \$325; Sidney H. Browne, \$470; Charles S. Reed II, \$400; Edward M. Ingle, \$730; Thomas S. Estes, \$1,309.50; Harlan B. Clark, \$1,550; Martin J. Hillenbrand, \$862.50; Kenneth S. Patton, \$5,660; Perry Ellis, \$796; Robert L. Buell, \$620; V. Lansing Collins, \$955; Paul Paddock, \$1,063; Courtland E. Christiani, \$1,203; George A. Armstrong, \$534.60; Duwayne G. Clark, \$7,311.53; E. Talbot Smith, \$2,780; Temple Wanamaker, Jr., \$130.33; James E. Brown, Jr., \$3,801.50; Cavendish W. Cannon, \$3,204; Homer S. Fox, \$4,560.08; Thomas McEnelly, \$331; Mrs. Anne Gault Antoniadis, \$100; Gladys Wells, \$1,112.63; M. William Blake, \$207.37; Nathaniel Lancaster, \$1,555.16; Norris B. Chipman, \$7,740; Harold Pease, \$583.99; John M. McSweeney, \$268; W. Garland Richardson, \$4,229.02; James W. Riddleberger, \$1,060.02; Carl E. Christopherson, \$1,189.31; Albert W. Chapman, \$1,419.98; Ann Hillery, \$759.87; Joseph W. Ballantine, \$425; Augustus Chase, \$580.77; Alfred G. Richter, Jr., \$544.68; Wallace W. Stuart, \$1,163.34; Jefferson Patterson, \$5,377.50; Frederick A. Kuhn, \$1,397.46; Ida Mae Orr, \$690.57; Lucille C. Strong, \$571.50.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider laid on the table.

GERALD G. WOODS

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1008, for the relief of Gerald G. Woods.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Gerald G. Woods, of Portsmouth, N. H., the sum of \$71.90, in full satisfaction of his claim against the United States for reimbursement for expenditures made by him as commander of flotilla No. 301, United States Coast Guard Auxiliary, for rations for members of such auxiliary engaged in operating a Coast Guard patrol boat: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwith-

standing. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAMUEL MARGOLIN

The Clerk called the next bill, S. 1169, for the relief of Samuel Margolin.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Samuel Margolin, of Auburn, Maine, the sum of \$1,427.50, in full satisfaction of all claims against the United States for compensation for property damage and personal injuries sustained and medical expenses incurred by him as a result of a collision of the truck which he was driving with a War Department sedan on Main Street, Lewiston, Maine, on January 10, 1943: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$1,427.50" and insert in lieu thereof "\$1,727.50."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LOUIS COURCIL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 248, for the relief of Louis Courcil.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is hereby authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Louis Courcil, the sum of \$5,000. The payment to the said Louis Courcil shall be in full settlement of all claims against the United States for hospital, medical, and other expenses, and for damages sustained on account of the injuries received by the said Louis Courcil, which resulted when an Army vehicle, serial No. 20203845, Service Company, One Hundred and Fifth Infantry, United States Army, left the lane of travel and progressed diagonally to the north curb lane on Foothill Boulevard, near Fontana, in the county of San Bernardino, State of California, and crashed into the automobile in which said Louis Courcil was seated: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, after the figures "\$5,000", strike out the period and "The payment to the said Louis Courcil shall be."

Page 1, line 7, after the word "for", insert "personal injuries."

Page 1, line 8, after the word "expenses", strike out the bill down to "Provided", in line 5, page 2. Insert in lieu thereof, "sustained as a result of an Army truck crashing into the automobile in which he was seated, on Foothill Boulevard, near Fontana, Calif., on January 21, 1942."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL J. CAMPBELL

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1220, for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul J. Campbell, father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor, of East St. Louis, Ill., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the Government of the United States for personal injury, medical and hospital bills, cost of artificial limb, and property loss sustained by the minor as the result of an automobile accident involving a Civilian Conservation Corps truck on United States Highway No. 66, at the intersection of Chapman Street, Edwardsville, Ill., after dark, on December 7, 1940: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "father of Paul M. Campbell, a minor."

Page 1, line 7, strike out the figures "\$5,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$2,000; to pay the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor, the sum of \$3,000."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "medical and hospital bills, cost of artificial limb, and property loss."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Paul J. Campbell, and the legal guardian of Paul M. Campbell, a minor."

MRS. DONALD B. JOHNSTON

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1934, for the relief of Mrs. Donald B. Johnston.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Donald

B. Johnston, of 300 Southeast First Avenue, Miami, Fla., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for the death of her husband, Donald B. Johnston, who was killed by the collision of a United States Army plane with an Eastern Air Lines plane piloted by him at the Thirty-sixth Street Airport, at Miami, Fla., on September 22, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert in lieu thereof "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

PAUL BARRERE

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1984, for the relief of Paul Barrere.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Paul Barrere, New Orleans, La., the sum of \$7,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States on account of a personal injury sustained on June 10, 1940, when he was thrown out of a truck while an inmate of the United States Public Health Hospital at Fort Worth, Tex.: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$7,500" and insert "\$1,500."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CHARLES R. HOOPER

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2075, for the relief of Charles R. Hooper.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Charles R. Hooper, of Washington, D. C., the sum of \$10,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by Charles R. Hooper while employed in the United States Navy

Yard at Washington, D. C., in the year 1894: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$10,000" and insert "\$5,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ROBERTA RAMSEY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2236, for the relief of Roberta Ramsey.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Roberta Ramsey, De Funiak Springs, Fla., the sum of \$92.40. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Roberta Ramsey against the United States for damage to her automobile which was struck on January 15, 1942, by a United States Army truck while such automobile was parked in an authorized parking space in De Funiak Springs, Fla.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 8, strike out "here" and insert "her".

Page 2, at the end of line 1, insert "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ETHEL PHILLIPS

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2315, for the relief of Ethel Phillips.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Ethel Phillips, of Elmira, N. Y., the sum of \$90.40, in full satisfaction of her claim against the United States for the cost of repairing an automobile owned by her which was damaged on January 18, 1943, when struck by a United States Army truck: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or re-

ceived by any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, on account of services rendered in connection with said claim. It shall be unlawful for any agent or agents, attorney or attorneys, to exact, collect, withhold, or receive any sum of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof on account of services rendered in connection with said claim, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendments:

Page 1, line 6, after "\$90.40", insert "and to pay the sum of \$23.25 to Mary Hurley, of Elmira, N. Y."

Page 1, line 8, strike out "her claim" and insert "their claims."

Page 1, line 9, strike out "an automobile" and insert "automobiles."

Page 1, line 10, strike out "her" and insert "them", and strike out "was" and insert "were."

The committee amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill for the relief of Ethel Phillips and Mary Hurley."

MRS. PRISCILLA B. MCCARTHY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2440, for the relief of Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. Priscilla B. McCarthy, of Louisville, Ky., the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, resulting in permanent disfigurement, sustained by her in an accident which occurred when the automobile in which she was riding was struck by a truck in the service of the National Youth Administration, driven by an employee of the National Youth Administration, on official Government business, near Bloomfield, Ky., on July 17, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

MRS. C. W. SELBY

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3039, for the relief of Mrs. C. W. Selby.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury is authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Mrs. C. W. Selby, Chester, Md., the sum of \$30. Such sum represents the loss sustained by the said Mrs.

C. W. Selby, as the result of the cashing of a money order for \$30, which had been issued to her, by a person having the same initials and last name and with the same address as the person for whom the money order was intended.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

BOARD OF TRUSTEES, SUMMERVILLE CONSOLIDATED SCHOOL DISTRICT, CHATTOOGA COUNTY, GA.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3062, for the relief of the Board of Trustees, Summerville Consolidated School District, Chattooga County, Ga.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I desire to offer a motion to recommit this bill to the Committee on Claims. Does that have to be made before the bill is considered or after?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman may ask unanimous consent to do that now.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that this bill be re-committed to the Committee on Claims for further consideration.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER]?

There was no objection.

HAMP GOSSETT CASTLE ET AL.

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3136, for the relief of Hamp Gossett Castle, Lois Juanita Gimble, Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, and Roy Martin Lyons.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Hamp Gossett Castle, of Mount Sylvan, Tex., the sum of \$2,500; to Lois Juanita Gimble, of Lindale, Tex., the sum of \$2,000; to Margaret Carrie Yarbrough, of Lindale, Tex., the sum of \$4,000; and to Roy Martin Lyons, of Lindale, Tex., the sum of \$5,000, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries, and hospital and medical expenses incident thereto, sustained when the automobile in which they were riding was struck by a United States Army truck about 8 miles east of Tyler, Tex., on the Tyler-Kilgore Highway, on August 30, 1941: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

Mr. MCGREGOR. Mr. Speaker, I offer an amendment, which I send to the Clerk's desk.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendments offered by Mr. MCGREGOR:

On page 1, line 6, strike out "\$2,500" and insert "\$1,500."

On page 1, line 7, strike out "\$2,000" and insert "\$1,500."

On page 1, line 9, strike out "\$4,000" and insert "\$2,000."

On page 1, line 10, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$2,500."

The amendments were agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

SAM SWAN AND AILY SWAN

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 1133, for the relief of Sam Swan and Aily Swan.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Sam Swan and Aily Swan, of Williamson, W. Va., the sum of \$3,600. The payment of such sum shall be in full settlement of all claims of the said Sam Swan and Aily Swan against the United States on account of damage to their home, owned jointly by them, caused by an explosion on October 13, 1941, in a stone quarry where blasting operations were being conducted by the Work Projects Administration: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$3,600" and insert "\$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

ANNA CHARACK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2469, for the relief of Anna Charack.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Anna Charack, the sum of \$2,500, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for personal injuries sustained by her on August 2, 1942, near Portland, Oreg., when the car in which she was traveling was struck by a United States Navy bus.

With the following committee amendment:

On page 1, line 10, after the word "bus" insert a colon and the following: "*Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

LEO GULLO

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 2999, for the relief of Leo Gullo.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, to Leo Gullo, route 1, box 204, Shreveport, La., the sum of \$8,336.02, in full settlement of all claims against the United States for property destroyed and damaged when a United States Army airplane (B-26 A No. 41-745) crashed into his dwelling near Lucas, La., on August 26, 1942: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 6, strike out "\$8,336.02" and insert "\$7,302."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

CLARA E. CLARK

The Clerk called the next bill, H. R. 3000, for the relief of Clara E. Clark.

There being no objection, the Clerk read the bill, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Treasury be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to pay, out of any money in the Treasury not otherwise appropriated, the sum of \$5,000 to Clara E. Clark, of Adrian, Mich., in compensation for injuries sustained on January 22, 1943, in the city of Adrian, Mich., on account of a fall in the Federal post-office building, at Adrian, Mich., caused by the slippery and dangerous condition of the floor in said post-office building on account of water, snow, and other dangerous conditions permitted therein: *Provided*, That no part of the amount appropriated in this act in excess of 10 percent thereof shall be paid or delivered to or received by any agent or attorney on account of services rendered in connection with this claim, and the same shall be unlawful, any contract to the contrary notwithstanding. Any person violating the provisions of this act shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor and upon conviction thereof shall be fined in any sum not exceeding \$1,000.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 5, strike out "\$5,000" and insert "\$3,000."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third

time, and passed, and a motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The SPEAKER. This completes the call of the Private Calendar.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HEIDINGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein two resolutions adopted by the Petroleum Industry War Council at a meeting held in Chicago on the 9th day of November 1943.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Illinois?

There was no objection.

INCREASE IN CERTAIN MONTHLY RATES OF COMPENSATION OR PENSION

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I call up House Resolution 339 for immediate consideration.

The Clerk read the resolution, as follows:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 hours, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

Mr. DELANEY. Mr. Speaker, I yield one-half hour to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH].

Mr. Speaker, yesterday the chairman of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation appeared before the Committee on Rules with the ranking minority member, the gentlewoman from Massachusetts [Mrs. ROGERS], and asked for a rule in regard to this measure. I doubt that there is much controversy about the rule, and I have no request for time on this side of the aisle.

This bill provides for increasing the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pensions payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and to veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1949, for service-connected disabilities, and for increasing the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and including widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act.

I ask that the gentleman from New York [Mr. FISH] use his time now.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, I yield myself 10 minutes and ask unanimous consent to proceed out of order for 5 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. FISH. Mr. Speaker, this bill comes from the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation with a unanimous report. The chairman of that committee the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] appeared before the Committee on Rules yesterday, which voted unanimously to grant a rule to bring up the bill today. All the bill does is increase the compensation of disabled veterans and their widows by 15 percent, due to the increase in the cost of living. It is only doing the fair thing for disabled war veterans and their dependents. The bill is short and contains the exact amount of the increase, in case any Member desires to study it. It has been endorsed by the American Legion, Veterans of Foreign Wars, and other veteran organizations.

FARM SUBSIDIES AND BUREAUCRATIC REGIMENTATION

Mr. Speaker, I have asked for a short time to speak out of order because I shall not be here next Thursday when the rule will come up on the subsidy bill. I would very much like to discuss the subsidy bill under the rule, but I will be unavoidably absent from the Congress on that day, so I propose to make a few comments at the present time, expressing my views in opposition to farm subsidies or doles.

Representative JOHN W. McCORMACK, Democratic floor leader, was quoted recently in the public press as follows:

A practical solution of the food-subsidy issue would be to take it to the polls next November and let the Nation decide it.

The farmers in New York State decided that issue on election day 2 weeks ago.

Apparently the White House, the "palace guard"—including the crackpot radicals, who are determined to regiment and socialize industry and agriculture, under the camouflage of winning the war—have not heard of the election returns from the farm districts of up-State New York and Kentucky. The National Grange, the American Farm Bureau Federation, and the Dairymen's League, as well as practically all farm organizations, are united in opposing Government food subsidies, political hand-outs, or bribes. The American farmers do not want cockeyed bureaucrats and collectivists regimenting their daily lives and controlling their liberties and personal acts. The farmers in up-State New York rolled up a Republican majority of 650,000 votes, which is unprecedented during the past 20 years.

The dairymen, the poultrymen, the apple growers and onion and vegetable producers in my congressional district are in a state of political rebellion against the stupidity and blunders of the Office of Price Administration, particularly the O. P. A. ceiling price of \$1.07 a bushel on corn, and against the proposed food subsidies and price roll-backs. There is already a critical shortage of feed for poultry and dairy cows in the

East due to the bungling of the O. P. A. and New Deal bureaucratic agencies. The farmers are tired of being kicked around and do not want to be liquidated or socialized by New Deal bureaucrats and radical crackpots. They regard the milk subsidies as bread-line payments and resent the stigma attached to it and believe that the subsidies, if any, should go to the consumers, who are the only beneficiaries.

The New Deal claims that the wage earners and consumers have so much money that they are fearful of inflation, yet profess that it will be a serious hardship for them to pay 1 cent more for a quart of milk. The consumer would far rather pay 1 cent more for a quart of milk than find their families without any milk due to a serious shortage, which is rapidly developing, as a result of O. P. A. blunders and regimentation. A continuation of the New Deal economic farm fallacies will endanger the health of 40,000,000 people living in 13 Northeastern States by seriously reducing the production of milk and eggs. The handling of the farm problem has been the greatest blunder and most colossal failure of all New Deal experiments as a result of which eastern farmers will have to lessen production or go out of business.

Subsidies inevitably mean more taxes, more debts, and more bureaucrats. Every farmer knows that the subsidy payments must come from tax dollars and out of the pockets of the American people, wage earners and consumers, including the farmers themselves or by further borrowing which would be an inflationary measure. Any subsidy paid by the Federal Government is and must be inflationary. I represent one of the greatest dairy districts in America, including Delaware County, but the political revolt extends beyond the dairymen to the poultry and egg producers and vegetable and fruit growers, and to all farmers.

A few weeks ago, on election day, the farmers made known their views in no uncertain terms, and if the same conditions continue until November 1944 the farm vote will be unanimous against New Deal regimentation, subsidies, and socialization.

Mr. Speaker, what the farmers resent above all is governmental regimentation, and further control by bureaucratic agencies here in Washington interfering with their daily lives and personal liberties. That was the issue in the recent election, not only on the farms but among the small businessmen, the small professional men, the home owners, and the entire middle class. It did not make a bit of difference whether they were Republicans or Democrats. In my assembly district in Orange County only one Democratic supervisor was elected, and he was elected on the Republican ticket. It was a clean anti-New Deal sweep, because voters, whether they were Republicans or Democrats, resented bureaucratic regimentation and dictatorship from Washington. They did not want to be liquidated by arrogant, radical, or communistic New Deal bureaucrats, so they decided, regardless of party

affiliation, to vote the straight Republican ticket from Lieutenant Governor right down through to the lowest office. The net result was that in up-State New York there was a 650,000 Republican majority, something unheard of in recent years. Local and county Democratic candidates were wiped out by an avalanche of votes cast by an aroused electorate who resented the socialistic, bureaucratic regimentation from Washington, not the farmers alone but the home owners, the small professional men, small businessmen, and storekeepers. They combined, regardless of politics, to oust and liquidate New Dealers before they were liquidated themselves.

Farmers are vigorously opposed to further regimentation by way of subsidies or political handouts, but so are most American taxpayers. Once the camel gets his nose under the tent and inhales the fragrance of subsidies it would cost the taxpayers several billion dollars a year.

I hope the Members of the Congress, regardless of party, will meet the issue fairly, head-on, without evasion, and vote the subsidies down, and not compromise in any way, as there is no basis for compromise. Either you are for subsidies or you are against them. Either you are for these farm subsidies, gratuities, and political bribes or you are not. That is a clear-cut issue. I hope it will be met squarely on that issue, whether you want more governmental and bureaucratic regimentation through subsidies or whether you want to put a stop to further regimentation, subsidies, and bureaucratic control. The issue does not affect farmers alone, it affects all the American people.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the resolution.

The resolution was agreed to.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill H. R. 3356, with Mr. THOMAS of Texas in the chair.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The first reading of the bill was dispensed with.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] is recognized for 1 hour, and, under the rule, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. ROGERS] is recognized for 1 hour.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the bill may be inserted in the RECORD at this point.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection? There was no objection.

Be it enacted, etc. That the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No.

2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, which are payable under any laws or regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 15 percent.

Sec. 2. That the monthly rates of compensation payable to widows and children under authority of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, shall be as follows: Widow but no child, \$35; widow and one child, \$45 (with \$5 for each additional child); no widow but one child, \$18; no widow but two children \$27 (equally divided); no widow but three children \$36 (equally divided) with \$4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

Sec. 3. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act.

Sec. 4. The benefits of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, are hereby extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war, as defined in existing law, subject to the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public, No. 484, as amended: *Provided*, That the definition of "widow" shall be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 15 minutes.

This measure provides for a 15-percent increase for the service-connected disabled veterans of the World War. The measure also provides an increase in the rate of compensation for the widows and orphans of veterans of the World War, that is, the veterans who had service-connected disabilities.

I know it will be contended that these increases should not be allowed at this time when we are straining every effort to raise funds for war purposes, but I cannot forget that these veterans and their dependents are war victims, victims of World War No. 1 and of World War No. 2.

We are not doing any more for them than we did for the Federal employees. We are not doing any more for them than has been done for the coal miners and the people employed on war projects throughout the country. The truth is that this increase does not absorb the increase in the cost of living. The cost of living has gone up on an average of 26 percent. Therefore I submit that raising this compensation 15 percent on an average is not a raid on the Treasury, especially at this time, when these disabled men are unable to secure employment.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. While expressing general sympathy for the measure, I ask the gentleman by what yardstick the 15 percent was arrived at.

Mr. RANKIN. That question was threshed out by the veterans' organizations. We held this measure back for almost a year. Representatives of the recognized veterans' organizations—the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, and the Order of the Purple Heart—came before the committee and urged its passage. Therefore, we have reported it to the House for your consideration. It will be followed by another measure in a day or two, providing for increased compensation for the non-service-connected totally disabled veterans of the World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. Yesterday, Monday, the question was raised about this additional compensation for these totally and permanently disabled veterans, and I found that Members of the House were astonished to know how the years have passed since World War No. 1. There are today 59,982 veterans of World War No. 1 between the ages of 60 and 64 years; between the ages of 65 and 74 years, inclusive, there are 32,157; above the age of 75, there are 33,381 veterans of World War No. 1. I give you these figures in order to answer those statements, in the RECORD a day or two ago, with reference to the other bill, a companion bill to this one, which I understand the Committee on Rules has reported and will be taken up tomorrow.

A question will probably be raised as to the cost of this measure. At the very outset the cost is estimated to be, the ultimate limit, \$24,773,000 a year. I know that is a considerable sum of money, although it sounds infinitesimal when we come to talk of the billions we are spending for other purposes.

There are a great many of these disabled men and a great many of these dependents who are unable to make a living at any kind of employment, who are dependent upon this compensation for their very existence. For that reason we have reported this bill out of the Committee on World War Veterans' Legislation unanimously in order not only to take care of this situation now, but to let our men who are in the service on every battle front in the world know that when they come back home disabled they are not going to have to seek the shelter of a jail or a poorhouse to find a place to sleep, and that their dependents will not be compelled to beg their bread from door to door.

Mr. SPRINGER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; I yield.

Mr. SPRINGER. I wish to compliment the gentleman on the fine service that he has rendered to the veterans of the World War No. 1, and also which he is now rendering to the veterans of World War No. 2. Quite recently increases were granted to civilian employees of the Federal Government, and many of those receiving those increases are able-bodied and strong; they are stalwart citizens,

while the veterans of World War No. 1 in many instances are greatly disabled. This same situation will soon be greatly augmented with respect to those who serve in World War No. 2. The casualty lists are growing daily.

Some of our comrades have not had any good jobs since they returned from World War No. 1, and they are left in a frightful situation.

Mr. RANKIN. And because of their disabilities they could not get employment in those war industries.

Mr. SPRINGER. That is true. I want to say to the gentleman, in order to get into these war industries and to get into the factories, practically all of those veterans are required to submit to a strict medical examination before they are taken into that employment, and these veterans who are suffering disabilities by reason of service in World War No. 1 have been unable to secure employment by reason of that fact. I wish to compliment the gentleman for the fine service he has rendered to our veterans. It is my hope this measure will be passed by a unanimous vote of the House.

Mr. RANKIN. I thank the distinguished gentleman from Indiana for his kind remarks. I want to say to the House that this is one committee in which there has been no politics. We have not played politics with human misery; we have not played politics with the disabled veterans; we have not played politics with the welfare of their dependents. But we have tried to do the very best we could for them, bearing in mind our obligations to the American people and our duty to the Federal Treasury.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. STEFAN. I want to voice the sentiment of my colleague from Indiana [Mr. SPRINGER] when he referred to the gentleman from Mississippi. [Mr. RANKIN] as a great friend of the veterans. I think the gentleman from Mississippi has done more for the welfare of veterans and their dependents than any other man that I know of.

In referring to the probable cost entailed in this bill, the gentleman indicated it would be something like \$24,700,000. The gentleman from Indiana referred to increases for civilian Federal employees, and I understand that amounted to something like \$500,000,000 a year, did it not?

Mr. RANKIN. I am not sure as to those figures.

Mr. STEFAN. I am told it is more than \$600,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. More than \$600,000,000 a year.

Mr. STEFAN. I do not think we are doing anything but what is absolutely just for veterans and their dependents in this bill. Can the gentleman tell me how this will affect a widow of an officer who died during World War No. 1? As I understand, she is receiving a fixed amount of \$25 a month now, is she not? Would she be benefited by this bill?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; her compensation would be raised to \$35 a month. If she

has one child it will be raised to \$45, with \$5 for each additional child. And where there is no widow but one child, it will be \$18 a month; no widow, with two children, it will be \$27 a month equally divided; no widow, with three children, it will be \$36 a month equally divided, with \$4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

Mr. STEFAN. Will the gentleman yield again?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. STEFAN. How will this affect the dependents of Spanish-American War veterans?

Mr. RANKIN. This does not touch Spanish-American War veterans. That is handled by the Pensions Committee.

Mr. STEFAN. I understand there is a bill, however, to give them some relief.

Mr. RANKIN. I understand there is a bill which has been reported out by that committee that gives them a similar increase, or probably more.

Mr. STEFAN. I thank you.

Mr. WRIGHT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Pennsylvania.

Mr. WRIGHT. I, too, wish to commend the gentleman from Mississippi not only for his work in connection with this bill but for his work generally in connection with legislation for the benefit of veterans. I want to ask the gentleman if he does not think, and I am sure that he does, that he voices the sentiments of this House and also of the country in general, that after this war we are not going to repeat the negligent treatment we accorded to soldiers after the last war, and that we are determined we are going to recognize the service they have given to their country.

Mr. RANKIN. Let me say in reply to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that after the last war it was agreed that the servicemen should have been paid \$60 a month to give them something like parity with pay received by men employed in every other vocation in America during that war. After the war we undertook to adjust that compensation. Enemies of that legislation called it a "bonus." It never was a bonus. We were merely adjusting that compensation. It took 17 years of bitter struggle to finally get that adjusted-compensation paid. The veterans took so much abuse that it hurt them in many ways, especially politically. For instance, the average State in this Union has never even elected a veteran of World War No. 1 as its chief executive, and it is the only war through which America ever passed that we went 25 years without electing anyone who was in service during that war as President of the United States.

So when the soldiers' pay bill came before the House a year ago I had served notice 6 months in advance that I was going to try to take care of the soldiers' pay while the war was going on and that I proposed to raise that base pay to \$50 a month.

When the bill came before the House I offered that amendment and secured its passage, raising the base pay to \$50 a month. We called the roll and it was carried by more than 10 to 1.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN] has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 additional minutes.

The bill went to conference and they knocked my amendment out. They came back and said, "You will have to take the small amount of raise provided, or vote down any raise at all." I happen to know the rules of the House. I knew that a motion to recommit would take precedence over any other motion. So I offered a motion to recommit, instructing the House conferees to stand by that \$50 amendment. That motion carried by 332 to 31, a little more than 10 to 1. Then the conferees raised it to \$46. They were still going to chisel the servicemen out of \$4 a month. But, when they did, the bill first had to go back to the Senate where it came from. I went over there and talked it over with Senator LA FOLLETTE and he agreed to offer the same motion there. The motion carried in the Senate, to instruct the Senate conferees to agree to that amendment. The vote was 58 to 20.

So in that way we raised the base pay to \$50 a month and adjusted, to that extent, the pay of the men in the service in this country, which should have been done in the First World War.

When this war is over it is my hope to give those men full pay for 6 months, or 9 months, or even 1 year after the war is over while they are settling back into their usual vocations, in order that we may not have to go through with that adjusted-compensation fight for another 15 or 20 years after this war closes.

We have had every kind of bill before our committee, and we have now, for increased pay for these disabled veterans and their dependents, but after going over it thoroughly with the veterans' organizations the committee decided that this bill would be as far as we would be justified in going at this time.

Mr. BREHM. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio.

Mr. BREHM. The gentleman has practically answered my question in the last sentence of his remarks. This bill only applies where service connection is shown?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. BREHM. Could it be possible to amend this bill to include total permanently disabled veterans which are not service connected?

Mr. RANKIN. That is provided for in H. R. 3377. It has already been reported by the World War Veterans' Legislation Committee, and a rule has been granted by the Rules Committee.

Mr. BREHM. So that takes care of that.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. COLE of New York. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. COLE of New York. Is this bill predicated upon any other consideration than the increased cost of living that is current in the country today?

Mr. RANKIN. A great many Members have felt for some time that these dependents of the service-connected deceased veterans were not adequately cared for.

Mr. COLE of New York. Even under normal conditions?

Mr. RANKIN. Even under normal conditions.

Mr. COLE of New York. So then, the justification for this bill is not limited solely to the increased cost of living?

Mr. RANKIN. No, not solely.

Mr. COLE of New York. That is the reason why the committee did not make the provisions of this bill temporary in their character, to last only during the war or for a short time thereafter, but made it permanent?

Mr. RANKIN. That is correct. Of course, Congress can change the law at any time.

Let me say to the Members of this Congress that I am grateful for what the Members on both sides have said about my being a friend of the veterans. Every Member of this Congress is a friend of the veterans of all wars. There are no enemies of veterans in Congress. No matter what party they represent, no matter what State they are from, they are all friends of the veterans. It is a question as to what is the best thing to do, and what we can do in order to meet the situation.

Now, on this question of the increased cost of living, some people are afraid that this will cause inflation. Now, do not get excited on the radio, or in the press, or on the floor of the House; inflation is already here. If any of you have a doubt about it I will cite you the record. Prices are governed in a free economy by the volume of the Nation's currency multiplied by the velocity of its circulation.

In 1917, we had in circulation \$40.23 per capita. In 1920, at the very peak of high prices, we had \$53.21 per capita in circulation; on the 31st day of September of this year, 1943, we had \$137.58 per capita in circulation, or more than three times what we had in 1917 and considerably more than twice what we had in 1920.

Oh, some may say that the population has increased. That is true. Had it stood still the per capita circulation would have been a great deal more. But let us read the figures as to what we had in circulation. Back in 1917, we had \$4,172,945,914 in circulation; in 1920 we had \$5,698,214,612 in circulation; today we have \$18,844,446,730 in circulation; in other words, we have gone from \$4,172,000,000 in 1917, to \$5,698,000,000 in 1920, and to \$18,844,000,000 at the present time. So this rise in the cost of living is simply an economic response to the volume of the currency in circulation multiplied by the rapidity of that circulation.

Let me say to the gentleman from New York [Mr. COLE] that it will be just about as impossible to deflate this currency back to what it was even before this war started and reduce commodity prices back to those levels as it would be, to use a Biblical expression, to "bind the sweet influence of Pleiades or loose the bands of Orion."

LXXXIX—605

You never could pay the national debt, you could not pay interest on it if you reduced the currency back to what it was before this war began.

So these veterans moving along with the natural tide of events are being victimized because the small amounts of their fixed incomes, and for that reason I and the other members of the committee acceded to the wishes of the veterans' organizations and brought this bill to the floor of the House. I trust it will be passed without opposition.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield.

Mr. ABERNETHY. Will the gentleman point out the discrimination which has been practiced against the employment of disabled veterans in view of the unemployment compensation laws of the country?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; where those laws are in existence a man is required to stand an examination, and in a great many cases they are turned down because they have some disability.

Mr. ABERNETHY. And they are refused employment because it increases the insurance premiums necessary to be carried by the employers.

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; that is the case all over the country. The distinguished gentleman from Missouri [Mr. COCHRAN] called that very forcibly to my attention the other day with reference to cases in Missouri and other States. These men, because of physical disabilities, are not only unable to get employment in the various munition plants and other war activities, but as the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] has said, in those States where they have compensation insurance laws or employer liability laws they turn these men down because they cannot stand the physical examination.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentlewoman from Massachusetts is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I should like to add to the gentleman's statement regarding the employability of veterans or rather their not employing them under civil service: The Civil Service Commission gives a veteran preference disability rating and then because he is disabled they will not employ him. So the veteran is penalized there because he has a disability. It is a very unjust situation.

Mr. Chairman, the veterans' laws we have passed during the years since the World War are complicated; it has been a piecemeal business. Veterans can apply sometimes under one law, sometimes under another, and secure more compensation under one law than under another. I hope some time we shall have legislation that will clarify this situation so it will be simpler for the veterans. Rating schedules should be improved and increased. I am very much troubled as I go through the hospitals today to find that many of the veterans do not know their rights regard-

ing compensation. I trust that the Veterans' Administration will insist upon representatives going through the hospitals, seeing the men at their beds, telling them their rights to compensation and insurance. I do not believe there is a human being in the country today that does not want the veterans of this war and all our wars adequately cared for. There is not a home that will not be touched in some way by this war—I hope lightly; I hope the veteran soldier of that home will not be injured, disabled, or lose his life—but every family will be touched in some way. It is only just that this Congress seek means to take care of them. It is our privilege and our sacred trust. Fighting in this war is the most horrible that has ever been known. There have been many cases of very weakening disease. Take malaria that is so prevalent in the South Pacific. It is very difficult sometimes to prove service connection in such cases. Take the enormous number of nervous cases that will come out of this war. In many instances it is going to be very difficult for them and their widows to prove that they have any service connection at all.

I want to give you some of the rates, in fact, all of them, because I shall ask unanimous consent to put them in the Record, that will be granted in increases to the veterans and their dependents.

Section 1 provides that the monthly amount of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, shall be increased by 15 percent. I have been asked the number that will be affected under this section. It is estimated this section will provide increases to approximately 329,100 veterans the first year at an additional cost of \$22,247,000. No one in the country will begrudge that payment, I am sure.

On July 13, 1943, the Congress granted the following increases to the widows where the veterans died of a service-connected disability:

Increase service-connected disability compensation, Public, 144, 78th Cong., July 13, 1943

| | |
|---|------|
| Widow, but no child..... | \$50 |
| Widow with 1 child (with \$13 for each additional child) (subject to apportionment regulations)..... | 65 |
| No widow, but 1 child..... | 25 |
| No widow, but 2 children (equally divided) (with \$10 for each additional child, total amount to be equally divided)..... | 38 |

Section 2 provides increases in monthly rates of compensation payable under Public Law numbered 484, as amended. It would increase the widow's rate from \$30 to \$35, and the widow with one child, additional amount for the child to be increased from \$8 to \$10 per month. Additional children would be increased from \$4 to \$5 per month. No widow, but one child, would be increased from \$15 to \$18 per month. No widow but

two children increased from \$22—equally divided—to \$27—equally divided—per month. No widow, but three children, increased from \$30—equally divided—to \$36—equally divided—per month, and the amount for additional children would be increased from \$3 to \$4 for each additional child, the total amount to be equally divided.

I will give you now the number and the cost. It is estimated that widows and children of approximately 33,500 deceased veterans would be entitled to the increased rates the first year at a total cost of \$2,526,000.

I may say that under this law dependency must be proved. If the widow's income exceeds \$1,000 she does not get it and the child does not get it. In the case of a widow with a child or children whose income exceeds \$2,500 she will not receive anything. There is a limitation there that at times may prove a difficult one, but it is there to keep the cost down.

Section 3 provides the increases authorized by this bill shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act.

Section 4 of the amended bill would extend the benefits of Public Law No. 484, as amended, to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war where death is not service connected but at time of death the veteran had a service-connected disability. Because the rate of deaths from other than service-connected disabilities would probably be small for veterans of this war who have been discharged from service, and because in many of the cases that could otherwise qualify, the veteran does not leave an eligible beneficiary, it is thought the cost of this section would be small the first year. Therefore, no estimate for the first year is submitted; however, there would be a materially increasing cost dependent upon the number of service-connected disabilities of this war.

The total estimated cost of this bill the first year will be approximately \$24,773,000.

When we think of the huge amounts that are being paid to so many different groups, this amount of money seems a mere bagatelle. However, it will bring a certain amount of comfort to the veterans and to their families. We are facing this very day unemployment in our own country in certain areas. The munition factories are closing down. I understand 45,000 in one war industry alone will go out within the next month. We are going to have a very great rehabilitation problem and reemployment problem to face. That makes this bill, in my opinion, even more necessary.

Mr. SPRINGER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Indiana.

Mr. SPRINGER. I want to congratulate the gentle lady upon the fine statement she has made and also to make this further observation. An increase was granted not so long ago by this House to the civilian Federal employees, and the aggregate amount of that increase was something over \$500,000,000 an-

nually. Many of those people are able-bodied citizens capable of working in any capacity. But the veterans of World War No. 1 have had trouble in securing employment by reason of their disabilities. In many of the plants doctors conduct a very rigid physical examination before they are able to secure employment, and many of those who came from World War No. 1 have been unable to secure any employment in the factories and plants throughout this country by reason of the disabilities they suffered. I think this legislation will be very helpful in that respect, and it will be helpful also to widows and the children of those veterans. I hope this measure will pass without a dissenting vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is absolutely true. Thursday, I saw a man at the Army hospital at Atlantic City from England, who had not been home in 2 years. He was wounded in Sicily. Naturally, he wants a transfer nearer home. As you all know, the readjustment after this terrible experience back into civilian life is something that has to be taken into consideration. I remember when reporting to President Calvin Coolidge regarding care of the veterans he always said to me: "I suppose none of us knows the strain that the veterans undergo during war." This is a much longer war.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 1 additional minute.

Mr. RAMSPECK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Georgia.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I do not want to let the remark of the gentleman from Indiana pass, because he said the Federal employees had received an increase in pay. In regard to all of them except postal employees, they received no increase except for increased hours.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That is true, but it means more money coming into their pockets, and it means a great deal in a very difficult time so far as food and various other things are concerned.

Mr. GREEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. Does this bill apply or have any provision for non-service-connected cases?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. It does for the widows and children of veterans who have a non-service-connected disability but who do not die of it, but not for the men. There is in another bill that will come up later on.

Mr. GREEN. The widows and children of the non-service-connected veterans will participate?

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. That schedule is in here, and I will put it in the RECORD.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Massachusetts has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. FURLONG].

Mr. FURLONG. Mr. Chairman, we were in a world crisis in 1917-18. We now are in the greatest crisis this Nation and the world has ever known.

The United States Government taught our young men and women the art of killing, how to wage war successfully, through the necessity of self-preservation for the democratic form of government.

Inasmuch as our armed forces led us out of chaos in the last war, they will lead us out in this war.

This Nation now has an honorable obligation to the men and women who offered their flesh, blood, and life, and to their widows and children, so that the Star-Spangled Banner shall ever wave "o'er the land of the free and the home of the brave," and so that light, liberty, and justice shall endure throughout the world.

Part of the obligation we owe World War No. 1 veterans and World War No. 2 veterans is that we pass this bill (H. R. 3356), so I humbly plead with you to remember and repay, by voting "yea."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. FAY].

Mr. FAY. Mr. Chairman, one of the Members was speaking a few moments ago about the employment of veterans who have been disabled in the war. You recall that during the Seventy-sixth Congress, in which I served, a man who had lost his leg and was a member of the World War Amputee organization in New York could not find employment in the Government Printing Office because of his disability. We tried, but they felt that the man was not suitable for employment there. I said at that time that if a man was not suitable for employment in the Government service, in his country's service, certainly private industry could say with equal face that he was not entitled to consideration by them.

This is a good bill, to increase the compensation by 15 percent. My associations and contacts with the veterans' organizations have, of course, been to a great extent with the disabled veterans. They have been unable to find employment in the new industries because they have been unable to perform the kind of work that goes with the skilled work in war industry. They must, of course, remain on their present white-collar jobs, or whatever they may be doing, at the same rate of pay they were receiving before the war. The cost of living has hit them tremendously. I know that if we pass this 15-percent increase it will be a well-deserved tribute to our disabled men of America.

I spent the summer of this year as a patient at Halloran General Hospital, where our wounded soldiers from overseas are being treated. They will be happy to know that we in Congress are going all out for our disabled veterans. They will be happy to know that Congress is united in action by all our Members to do the right thing by the men

who have suffered and bled that our Nation might live.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 minutes for the purpose of answering a question the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] wishes to ask.

Mr. RAMSPECK. The question I wish to ask is whether or not the gentleman thinks the passage of this bill would create a precedent for the increase of payments to annuitants under the Federal civil-service retirement law or the social-security law or the Railroad Retirement Act?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not think so, for the reason that those retirement benefits are in the form of insurance benefits for which the beneficiaries paid when they were in the employment of the Government or the enterprises for which they worked. Therefore, they are receiving just what their contracts call for. This is a different proposition. These are victims, you might say, of the wars through which we have passed and in which these disabled men and the husbands and fathers of these dependents fought. We owe them an obligation to see that they are properly cared for. Therefore, I do not think this would be any precedent at all for increasing the pay of people who are on Federal retirement or any other retirement for which they paid during the days of their employment.

Mr. RAMSPECK. I am glad to hear the gentleman's assurance on that point.

Mr. GREEN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Florida.

Mr. GREEN. We hope that this bill will apply to World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 cases.

Mr. RANKIN. It does.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 2 additional minutes.

Mr. CASE. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. CASE. I notice the language of the bill applies to service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, and so forth. What is the reason for not including the special awards and allowances?

Mr. RANKIN. I may say to the gentleman from South Dakota that those awards were fixed not on the basis so much of the disability as of attempting to allay the spread of disease, for instance, tuberculosis. The gentleman will find that men who have arrested tuberculosis have been allotted \$50 a month, I believe it is. That was arbitrary, it is true, but it was thought at that time that that would be better than running the risk of their spreading tuberculosis by not having any compensation at all to take care of them.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. In the case of insurance, the insurance is a

business proposition and the man pays for it himself.

Mr. RANKIN. Certainly. If a man had \$10,000 of insurance, his widow gets \$57.50 a month for 20 years. Of course, we could not afford to increase that.

Mr. CASE. The cases I have in mind are cases where the merits of the case were such that prior to the enactment of the law which made the particular case eligible a special act was passed. Subsequently the basic law was changed, in some instances so that those individuals would be eligible under the general law. However, by reason of the fact that the special act was passed for them, the Veterans' Administration rules that that is controlling, and even though now they would be eligible and get more under the general law, they are held to the special law.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has again expired.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield myself 5 additional minutes.

Of course, they made a mistake then, according to the gentleman's statement, of having a special law passed.

In that connection, I take this occasion to point out that this committee has never passed a private pension law. I hope that in the years to come it will not adopt that policy. However, we have provided a law that is liberal, so that everyone who comes under the provisions of that law will be treated equitably. When you begin to pass private pension bills you very often have to correct somebody's military service record that is in question. You can remember back in the old days when Grover Cleveland wielded his pen so effectively in vetoing bills of that character, and a great amount of political repercussion grew out of it. So, when this committee was organized under the leadership of the distinguished gentleman from South Dakota, Mr. Royal Johnson, he took the position that by all means we should avoid a mix-up of that kind.

We adopted the rules of the committee and the committee adhered to them during the 8 years that he was chairman, and the committee has adhered to that rule during the 13 years that I have been chairman. So this applies not to these special awards, but to the ones that come under the general rules of the legislative act.

Mr. CASE. I am very glad to have the chairman's explanation in the RECORD, because it will afford me opportunity to give careful explanation to the people who have written me about it.

Mr. RANKIN. I hope from now on that the Congress will frown on passing private pension bills, but will pass a law to cover the men in the service so that everyone who measures up to the standard fixed may be taken care of on an equal basis.

Mr. LUDLOW. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. LUDLOW. I understood the gentleman to say that the estimated cost of this would be about \$24,000,000.

Mr. RANKIN. That is the estimate of the Veterans' Administration.

Mr. LUDLOW. My understanding is that the cost of a modern battleship, with all of its features, is around a little more than \$100,000,000, so that the entire cost of doing justice to these disabled veterans, would be less than one-fourth of the cost of one battleship. Is that correct?

Mr. RANKIN. It is, and I say to the gentleman that a short time ago Congress passed a bill remitting about \$5,000,000,000 in income taxes that had already accrued, and if that money were applied to this purpose, it would take care of these veterans for a long time.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. MAGNUSON. Does the gentleman have any figures generally as to how many disabled veterans of this war would be included under these benefits?

Mr. RANKIN. I do not believe that I have the number here. Yes, my colleague, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. ABERNETHY] calls attention to the fact that it would cover 329,100.

Mr. MAGNUSON. From the present war?

Mr. RANKIN. That is World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. Of course you cannot tell how many casualties we will have in this war.

Mr. MAGNUSON. I mean up to date. I was trying to get some idea if the gentleman had any.

Mr. RANKIN. I have it here in the report. For World Wars Nos. 1 and 2, the number to date is 329,100.

Mr. MAGNUSON. And there is no break-down as to what the number would be of World War No. 2.

Mr. RANKIN. No.

Mr. ANGELL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes.

Mr. ANGELL. This bill in no way touches veterans of the Spanish-American War?

Mr. RANKIN. No; that comes from another committee.

Mr. ANGELL. What is the status of legislation giving relief to those veterans of the Spanish-American War?

Mr. RANKIN. I understand a similar bill has been reported by that committee.

Mr. ANGELL. I hope it will receive early consideration. The Congress has been guilty of failure to appreciate the outstanding service of these veterans of 1898 in failing to make adequate provision for them.

Mr. Chairman, I am supporting the pending bill. It provides an increase of approximately 15 percent to veterans and their dependents. We must provide adequately for the men who are fighting to protect America and we want them to know that the folks back home will not permit their dependents to be in need while they are at the front.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the remainder of my time and ask the gentleman from Massachusetts to yield some of her time.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Iowa [Mr. CUNNINGHAM].

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, H. R. 3356 provides for a 15-percent increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disabilities and to widows and children of veterans as well as their dependent parents. There are four sections of this bill. Section 1 increases by 15 percent the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable for wartime service-connected disabilities of veterans of World War No. 1, as well as for veterans of World War No. 2, who saw service on and after September 15, 1940, which, as I understand it, is the effective date of the Selective Service Act.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield at this point?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I would rather finish my statement before yielding. Section 2 increases the rate of compensation of widows and children and dependent parents compensation. Under existing law a widow with no child receives \$30 per month. Under the provisions of the bill under consideration, a widow with no child would receive \$35 per month. Under existing law, a widow with one child would receive \$38 per month and \$4 for each additional child. Under the present bill, a widow with one child would receive \$45 per month, with \$5 for each additional child. Under the present law, no widow but one child would receive \$15 per month, and under the present bill \$18 a month. Under existing law, with no widow but two children they would receive \$22 per month, and under the proposed bill \$27 per month. Under present law, no widow, but three children would receive \$30 per month, with \$3 for each additional child, and under the present bill \$36 a month and \$4 for each additional child.

Section 3 of this bill provides that these increases shall become effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of the act.

Section 4 of this bill provides that the benefits provided for herein are extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war.

Mr. Chairman, as I see it, the only possible objection that could be raised to this bill would be one of economy. No one in this House is more economy-minded than I am, where it is right to be economy-minded. But when we consider the veterans of this and other wars, as well as their dependents, their widows and their children, we cannot be economy-minded, taking into consideration the cost of living as it is today. That is not the right attitude to have toward those who have given their lives and their blood for us. This bill will correct some of the inequalities that now exist.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Has the gentleman heard one word mentioned about economy in this bill? I have not heard it anywhere.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I say that is the only objection that could possibly be raised to it. No; I have not heard that mentioned.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from New York.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I am very much concerned and I am in sympathy with the purposes of the act and in that it is going to do something for soldiers and their dependents. I am also interested in the parent who is dependent on the soldier's income.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. This bill takes care of dependents.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. I do not seem to find it in H. R. 3356.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. You will find it in the report on page 2.

Mr. DICKSTEIN. There is not a word about it in the bill. You take care of the wives, children, and widows, but you say nothing here about the parent who is dependent upon the support of the son.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. As I understand it, that is taken care of. This is an amendment to another public law. Is that right, may I ask the gentleman from Mississippi?

The question of the gentleman from New York is that he finds nothing in the bill to include dependent parents.

Mr. RANKIN. No, that is not in the bill; that is non-service-connected cases.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But it is mentioned in the report.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentlewoman from Massachusetts.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Of course, in service-connected cases there would be an increase in everything, including widows and dependent parents?

Mr. RANKIN. Yes; but not in non-service-connected cases.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. But not in service-connected cases?

Mr. RANKIN. That is right.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, the leaders of our present war, as well as generals and admirals in the past, have depended largely upon morale. To me, this bill under consideration is a very good bill and a very strong bill for the present morale of our fighting men. Let us look at Mrs. Johnson whose husband is serving in the Army. She writes her husband a letter and says, "I just came back from across the street where Mrs. Smith lives, whose husband was killed at Guadalcanal a few months ago. I find Mrs. Smith over there with two children. She receives around \$35 or \$40 a month from the Government. She is unable to work. She cannot live on the amount she is getting with present prices. Something will have to be done for her." That boy out in the service receives that letter and he gets to thinking, "Would my wife be in the same condition if I were killed today or tomorrow

or sometime in the future?" He talks to his buddy. It goes all through the armed forces. Nothing could do more, in my opinion, to shatter the morale of our fighting men than a letter of that kind.

The passage of this bill raises the amount so that so many of that kind of letters cannot be written. The gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN], the chairman of our committee, for whom I have so much respect and regard, talked about inflation. He said inflation is here now. With that I agree, but not entirely.

Inflation is certainly here for those with fixed incomes whose income has not increased since Pearl Harbor in proportion to the increase in the cost of living and consumer goods. But inflation certainly is not here for those whose income or wages or whatever they receive has increased in proportion with or greater than the cost of living or the cost of consumer goods. But for the people to be affected by this bill, H. R. 3356, the income of those individuals has not increased since Pearl Harbor, whereas the cost of consumer goods and the cost of living has increased tremendously. Therefore, inflation is a very vital factor to the ones to be benefited by this bill and the passage of it will help to do away with some of the present existing inequalities.

Mr. RANKIN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. I yield to the gentleman from Mississippi.

Mr. RANKIN. These people then, unless we do increase their compensation, are victims of inflation?

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Absolutely, just as aged people who are receiving the same pension today which they received 1, 2, and 3 years ago, without increase. They are subject to the increased cost of living, but their income has not increased.

Mr. RANKIN. Just as the farmers, whose prices for raw materials have not been increased.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Exactly, where we are keeping some commodities below parity under an act of Congress or by the Office of Price Administration at this time.

Another point I wish to emphasize in conclusion in regard to the favorable passage of this bill was brought out very clearly to me by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. RAMSPECK] when he rose previously. He recalled to my mind that this House has already passed a 15-percent increase for all Federal employees under civil service.

Certainly we can do as much for the veterans of the last war and the veterans of this war as well as for his widow and children.

I yield back the balance of my time, Mr. Chairman.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER].

Mr. SCRIVNER. Mr. Chairman, just so there shall be no misunderstanding, I want to touch upon one matter in this

bill that has not been thoroughly discussed, so there will be no repetition on the part of those speaking on behalf of the bill.

Section 2, as you may or may not know or understand, does not provide for allowances to widows and children of men who have died of service-connected disabilities. This is simply an allowance to those widows and orphans of men, who were receiving some service-connected disability allowance, but whose death was not the result of that service-connected disability.

There has been some question raised in times past, as to the reason for such an allowance. There has never been any question about the allowance to widows and children of service-connected cases, but the reason is simply this: It is a matter of justice, not charity, to those widows and children in providing them an allowance which the man himself could not give them. Because of his receiving service-connected disability allowance he was unable to procure insurance with which to protect his widow and children. The minute he went to an insurance company and made application for a policy, he had to disclose, as he was required to do, the fact that he had a service-connected disability. Almost immediately and without exception, it barred him from obtaining for his wife and family that much needed protection in case of his death.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCRIVNER. I yield.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. Is that soldier barred from every company, regardless of whether he pays an increased premium or not?

Mr. SCRIVNER. Not every company.

Mr. CUNNINGHAM. But if he gets insurance he has to pay a higher premium than he otherwise would pay?

Mr. SCRIVNER. If he is able to obtain insurance at all, it is at an increased premium. Sometimes he cannot get any whatsoever.

Of course, we all had \$10,000 insurance 25 years ago, but we were not all wise enough or financially able to hold onto it. Then after we had allowed some of it to lapse we were not able to comply with the veterans' insurance regulations with reference to the payment of back premiums and thus we deprived our widows and children of that much needed protection.

I am reminded at this time there was one of our Presidents who said that war veterans have a greater claim upon us than any other class of our citizens. I am quite sure that if there is any defect in this bill at all, the defect is on the side of not giving these widows and children a larger increase than this bill provides.

After having swallowed so many camels we certainly should not strain at a gnat.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. McGREGOR].

Mr. McGREGOR. Mr. Chairman, I just want to congratulate the committee on reporting out H. R. 3356. This is one bill that certainly should pass this House by a unanimous vote. It is a bill that is giving aid to a certain group of individuals, veterans, who have been the victims of innocent circumstances during this inflationary period. I trust it will pass this House by unanimous vote.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT].

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Chairman, I too, want to express my appreciation to the committee for bringing out this piece of legislation. I am glad it comes from the committee which was presided over by my predecessor, Mr. Royal C. Johnson of South Dakota, who was succeeded by an equally able man, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. RANKIN].

I feel that if there is any weakness in this bill, it is on the side of providing too meager an assistance, and that we have failed, perhaps, to provide as adequately as this country might well afford, for the disabled veterans, and the widows and orphans.

However, I shall support the legislation in its present form. It is manifestly a step toward justice and fair play. I urge that every Member of the House support H. R. 3356. It deserves your unanimous vote.

There may be some, Mr. Chairman, who would argue for economy in opposition to this highly merited increase in pensions for disabled veterans. I yield to no Member of the House in my desire and my effort to curtail wasteful Government spending and to put an end to the reckless extravagance which has both marked and marred the present administration as the most profligate and uneconomic in the American history. However, the place to start such economies is obviously not with the men who have lost their health or become crippled in mind or body while fighting the Nation's wars. To these heroes we can never extend our full debt of gratitude, we can never fully repay them for their sacrifices. What we do today in the passage of this bill is but a very small token payment, Mr. Speaker, on the great debt which this Republic owes the disabled veterans of the United States.

In this era of billion dollar boondoggling and global gifts of taxpayers' funds the comparatively trifling annual cost of these additional pension payments is indeed inconsequential. As the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. SCRIVNER] so aptly said a few moments ago, we have swallowed so many camels the past few years that this is no time to strain at a gnat. Let us pass this legislation today by a unanimous vote despite the widely rumored report that it is being done over the protest of the executive department. In the total cost of war the cost of dealing justly if not generously with those who have made the sacrifice of life or limb is but a fractional factor. Let us hope that we can learn to live at peace in this world but in the meantime the costs

of providing this Republic with an adequate defense system and of dealing justly with our veterans is something which we cannot and must not evade and on which we cannot use the paring knife of economy too deeply without injury to our country and injustice to those who have fought to keep it safe and great.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUSBEY].

Mr. BUSBEY. Mr. Chairman, there has been some discussion during this debate regarding the increased cost of living and inflation. I should like to call the attention of the House to this particular fact: These disabled veterans are not members of a union that will fight for increased compensation; they must rely upon such organizations as the American Legion, the Veterans of Foreign Wars, the Disabled American Veterans, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Congress of the United States. It is our duty, therefore, to see that these veterans are taken care of. During the hearings before our committee on this bill, H. R. 3356, it was brought out that the average wage being paid to employees in manufacturing plants in this country when the original adjusted-compensation law was passed was \$1,100 per year. At the present time the average wage in industry is more than \$2,000 per year, but the compensation for these disabled veterans has remained stationary.

This country of ours will remain great just as long as the people and the Congress pay proper tribute and honor to our heroes, and these boys are certainly the heroes of this country. The minute we refuse to recognize that fact, then this Nation of ours will start on its decline. I sincerely trust, therefore, Mr. Chairman, that this bill, H. R. 3356, will pass unanimously today.

Mr. Chairman, I yield back the balance of my time.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Florida [Mr. PETERSON], a member of the committee.

Mr. PETERSON of Florida. Mr. Chairman, it was originally my intention to explain the bill, but that has been done very well. Then it was my intention to explain the difficulties many of these veterans and their loved ones have had by reason of the increased cost of living; that has been well done also. Then it was my intention to rise and compliment the able chairman and the rest of the members of the committee on reporting out this bill; and that has been done in fine words also. Then I finally revised my own mental remarks to say that I will express to the House the hope that this bill would pass unanimously; and that has been done by the preceding speaker. But I do want to say that this is a good bill; it is a bill that is needed and needed at once. I want to compliment the chairman of the committee on the hard work he has been doing on this veterans' committee. He is conscientious; he studies legislation; he realizes the problems of the veterans and their

dependents and he is doing a good job. I want to compliment him on getting this bill out and I hope we will show our real interest by voting for it unanimously. I hope there is not a vote against it. Living costs are going up—let us act promptly and favorably on this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. WICKERSHAM].

Mr. WICKERSHAM. Mr. Chairman, I desire to compliment this committee and the members thereof on this splendid piece of legislation. I used to be a member of this committee. I shall support this legislation.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield 5 minutes to the distinguished gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. CURLEY].

PROTECTION, NOT PROMISES, FOR VETERANS AND THEIR DEPENDENTS

Mr. CURLEY. Mr. Chairman, it is indeed a pleasure to extend congratulations to Congressman RANKIN, of Mississippi, not only for this bill which he has fathered making provision for the veterans and their dependents, both of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, but for his untiring and highly intelligent effort at all times in behalf of every measure of legislation having for its purpose protection and benefit to the men who have served our country in the hour of trial.

His is a unique distinction, the father and defender of essential legislation in protection of servicemen of all wars. The bill under consideration, H. R. 3356, provides for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disability and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended:

Be it enacted, etc., That the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, which are payable under any laws or regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration, are hereby increased by 15 percent.

SEC. 2. That the monthly rates of compensation payable to widows and children under authority of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, shall be as follows: Widow but no child, \$35; widow and one child, \$45 (with \$5 for each additional child); no widow but one child, \$18; no widow but two children, \$27 (equally divided); no widow but three children, \$36 (equally divided), with \$4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

SEC. 3. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the first day of the first month following the passage of this act.

SEC. 4. The benefits of public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, are hereby extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war, as defined in existing law, subject to the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public Law No. 484, as amended: *Provided*, That the definition of "widow" shall be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943.

Amend the title so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

The American people and the American Government have always been prolific in promises to the veterans but sterile in fulfillment. I can recall World War No. 1 and the promises made to the men entering the armed service and the protection likewise promised to their dependents. I can well recall the return of the veterans at the termination of the war in 1918. I can recall the streets crowded with these men who had served with distinction and honor in the period of the First World War seeking in vain opportunity for employment. I recall in 1922, more than 3 years after the war had ended, on assuming the office of mayor of Boston, finding the soldiers' relief rolls of the city reaching the staggering figure of \$200,000 for the year as against the normal expenditure of \$40,000 a year. I was not so greatly disturbed about the amount of money expended for soldiers' relief as I was by the fact that in the acceptance of the relief the men were forfeiting their self-respect and their self-reliance so essential to the perpetuation of good American citizenship. Wheels of industry were moving slowly, if at all, and it was essential that something be done to relieve the situation. As mayor I made it my business to provide public work, namely, the Dorchester Rapid Transit System, costing \$11,000,000, the Governor Square Rapid Transit System, costing five and one-half million dollars, and the East Boston development at a cost of an additional one million and a half. It seems rather difficult to believe, nevertheless true, that many men who entered the service left good positions, but with the assurance from their employers on their return the old job would be open for them, and found on their return their positions filled by less patriotic Americans, and no job open for them, despite the fact that many had families dependent upon them. In the public-works program as inaugurated by me in 1922, I made a provision that only veterans could be employed with a result that it was possible to absorb in gainful employment and at a high wage more than 8,500 men who had served the country in its hour of need and who through their employment found it possible to preserve their self-respect and self-reliance.

I had occasion to be present at Washington at the time of what was familiarly known as the bonus march and the impression made upon me will last as long as life itself. I saw men wheeled along in hand carts with both legs gone and I saw blind men led along by their buddies and I read with horror, shortly thereafter, of the tragedy at Anacostia.

The men who marched to Washington seeking a fulfillment of the pledge of ad-

justed compensation were men who had been maimed in the service of their country in the hour of trial, they sought only that which the Government had promised them and to which they were clearly entitled. They found it difficult to secure quarters with their meager store of money in Washington so they encamped on the dump at Anacostia and since they were abiding by the laws and violating none they refused to leave when ordered. Then came the order issued by the then President of the United States, Herbert Hoover, for the armed forces to drive them out—with the result that many were killed and wounded, but they assembled later on that fateful day on the steps of the Capitol. They assembled without indulging in speeches denouncing the Government for the killed and wounded of many of their comrades but they assembled and joined in the singing of "My Country 'Tis of Thee, Sweet Land of Liberty" an exhibition of patriotism and devotion never excelled in the history of the world. The killing and the maiming of these men and the suffering of the soldiers and their dependents would have been unnecessary provided legislation had been enacted rather than promised for their protection. We are engaged today in the enactment of legislation, not in the promising of legislation and it is to be hoped that no man who deems himself worthy of the title American citizen will be found voting against the pending measure.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from California [Mr. HOLIFIELD].

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Mr. Chairman, I rise in support of H. R. 3356. I want to compliment at this time the Veterans' Committee and its able chairman in the production of this bill for our consideration. Frequently we have occasion to make adjustments such as this. At the time these pensions were granted, they were granted in the opinion of those who passed on it, on the basis of the need of the soldiers of that day. Due to the fact that the purchasing power of the dollar rises and falls from year to year and from generation to generation, what was just at one time becomes unjust a few years later. This is an attempt to rectify the deceased purchasing power of the dollar.

I hope at some future time that the pensions settled upon our veterans will be settled in such a way that they will maintain a closer relationship to the purchasing power of the dollar, the pension to be adjusted from time to time and at stated intervals, in order to maintain a standard of living from year to year on the same basis as at the time of its original passage. Even as we strike an average from Dow Jones on stocks and bonds I think we can strike an average on the cost of living. I hope some day to see these pensions adjusted on the basis of recurring adjustments, according to the purchasing power of the dollar.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Chairman, I yield such time as he may desire to the gentleman from Arizona [Mr. MURDOCK].

Mr. MURDOCK. Mr. Chairman, although I am not on the Veteran Affairs Committee of the House, I do have a

great interest in matters pertaining to all veterans but especially of the First and Second World Wars. One of the several reasons for my interest in them is that because of the climate and health inducements of Arizona more ex-service-men are in my State than Arizona furnished originally to the former wars. I have learned from many of them recently that the increased cost of living is pressing hard upon them at this time. I think Congress should provide greater benefits for all, or at least for those toward whom the Government's obligation is greatest.

If we had been better able to hold the line and minimize the increased cost of living to a greater extent than we have been able to do, such legislation as this would not be so urgent. It was one time thought that a 15-percent increase in compensation to Government employees would more than cover the increased cost of living to them. We have so provided it, or attempted to provide it, in legislation. Laboring men have told me that the Little Steel formula, which is based on a 15-percent increase, is now obsolete. I want to fight inflation but recognize in my family bills each month that the cost of living has gone up and that we must take such into account in dealing with the Nation's defenders and their dependents.

I am greatly alarmed and distressed at the prospect that, in spite of all our efforts to hold back the rising tide of inflation, it will bring suffering to the millions who are not drawing war wages or obtaining war profits and who must live on fixed incomes diminishing in purchasing power. As a part of that group to be protected, exservicemen and their dependents are our first direct responsibility. I favor the passage of this bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read the bill for amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the monthly rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-incurred disability, not including the special awards and allowances fixed by law, which are payable under any laws or regulations administered by the Veterans' Administration are hereby increased by 15 percent.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 1, line 4, after the word "veterans", insert "of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, including veterans entitled to wartime rates under Public, 359, Seventy-seventh Congress, December 19, 1941, for service on and after September 16, 1940."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The Clerk read as follows:

SEC. 2. That the monthly rates of compensation payable to widows and children under authority of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, shall be as follows: Widow but no child, \$35; widow and one child, \$45 (with \$5 for each additional child); no widow but one child, \$18; no widow but two children, \$27 (equally divided); no widow but three chil-

dren, \$36 (equally divided), with \$4 for each additional child (the total amount to be equally divided).

SEC. 3. The increases provided by this act shall be effective from the 1st day of the first month following the passage of this act.

With the following committee amendment:

Page 2, after line 14, insert the following: "Sec. 4. The benefits of Public Law No. 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, are hereby extended to widows and children of persons who served during the period of the present war, as defined in existing law, subject to the administrative, definitive, and regulatory provisions of Public, No. 484, as amended: *Provided*, That the definition of 'widow' shall be that contained in section 6 of Public Law No. 144, Seventy-eighth Congress, July 13, 1943."

The committee amendment was agreed to.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2 and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

The CHAIRMAN. Under the rule, the Committee rises.

Accordingly the Committee rose; and Mr. O'NEAL having taken the chair as Speaker pro tempore, Mr. THOMAS of Texas, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that Committee, having had under consideration the bill (H. R. 3356) to provide for an increase in the monthly rates of compensation or pensions payable to disabled veterans for service-incurred disabilities and to widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, June 28, 1934, as amended, pursuant to House Resolution 339, reported the same back to the House with sundry amendments agreed to in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under the rule, the previous question is ordered.

Is a separate vote demanded on any amendment? If not, the Chair will put them in gross.

The amendments were agreed to.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time and was read the third time.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the passage of the bill.

The question was taken; and on a division (demanded by Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts) there were—ayes 150, noes 0.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I object to the vote on the ground that a quorum is not present.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair will count. [After counting.] One hundred and sixty-three Members are present, not a quorum.

The Doorkeeper will close the doors, the Sergeant at Arms will notify absent Members, and the Clerk will call the roll.

The question was taken; and there were—yeas 343, nays 0, not voting 88, as follows:

[Roll No. 161]

YEAS—343

| | | |
|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Abernethy | Fenton | Larcade |
| Allen, Ill. | Fernandez | Lea |
| Allen, La. | Fish | LeCompte |
| Andersen, | Fisher | LeFevre |
| H. Carl | Fitzpatrick | Lemke |
| Anderson, Calif. | Flannagan | Lesinski |
| Anderson, | Folger | Lewis, Ohio |
| N. Mex. | Fulbright | Luce |
| Andresen, | Fuller | Ludlow |
| August H. | Furiong | Lynch |
| Andrews | Gale | McCord |
| Angell | Gallagher | McCormack |
| Arends | Gamble | McCowan |
| Arnold | Gathings | McGehee |
| Auchincloss | Cavagan | McGranery |
| Baldwin, Md. | Gavin | McGregor |
| Barden | Gearhart | McKenzie |
| Barrett | Gibson | McMillan |
| Barry | Gifford | McMurray |
| Bates, Ky. | Gilchrist | McWilliams |
| Beall | Gillete | Maas |
| Beckworth | Goodwin | Magnuson |
| Bender | Gordon | Mahon |
| Bennett, Mich. | Gorski | Maloney |
| Bennett, Mo. | Graham | Manasco |
| Bishop | Granger | Mansfield, |
| Blackney | Grant, Ala. | Mont. |
| Bloom | Green | Mansfield, Tex. |
| Bolton | Gregory | Martin, Mass. |
| Bradley, Pa. | Griffiths | Mason |
| Brehm | Gross | May |
| Brown, Ga. | Gwynne | Michener |
| Brown, Ohio | Hagen | Miller, Conn. |
| Bryson | Hale | Miller, Mo. |
| Buffett | Hall | Miller, Nebr. |
| Burch, Va. | Edwin Arthur | Miller, Pa. |
| Burchill, N. Y. | Halleck | Mills |
| Burdick | Hancock | Monkiewicz |
| Burgin | Hare | Morrison, N. C. |
| Busbey | Harris, Ark. | Mruk |
| Butler | Hartley | Mundt |
| Byrne | Hays | Murdoch |
| Camp | Hébert | Murphy |
| Canfield | Heffernan | Murray, Tenn. |
| Cannon, Fla. | Heldinger | Murray, Wis. |
| Cannon, Mo. | Herter | Newsome |
| Capozzoli | Hess | Norman |
| Carlson, Kans. | Hill | Norrell |
| Carson, Ohio | Hinshaw | O'Brien, Ill. |
| Carter | Hobbs | O'Brien, Mich. |
| Case | Hoch | O'Brien, N. Y. |
| Chapfield | Hoeven | O'Connor |
| Church | Hoffman | O'Hara |
| Clark | Holtfield | O'Konski |
| Clason | Holmes, Mass. | O'Neal |
| Clevenger | Holmes, Wash. | O'Toole |
| Cochran | Hope | Outland |
| Cole, Mo. | Horan | Pace |
| Cole, N. Y. | Howell | Patman |
| Colmer | Hull | Patton |
| Compton | Jarman | Peterson, Fla. |
| Cooley | Jenkins | Peterson, Ga. |
| Cooper | Jennings | Pfeifer |
| Courtney | Jensen | Philbin |
| Cox | Johnson, | Phillips |
| Crawford | Calvin D. | Pittenger |
| Crosser | Johnson, Ind. | Floesser |
| Cunningham | Johnson, | Plumley |
| Curlley | Luther A. | Poage |
| Curtis | Johnson, | Poulsen |
| D'Alesandro | Lyndon B. | Powers |
| Day | Johnson, Okla. | Pracht |
| Delaney | Johnson, Ward | Price |
| Dickstein | Jonkman | Ramey |
| Dilweg | Kean | Ramspeck |
| Dingell | Kearney | Randolph |
| Disney | Keefe | Rankin |
| Ditter | Kelley | Reed, Ill. |
| Domenegeaux | Kennedy | Reed, N. Y. |
| Dondro | Keogh | Rees, Kans. |
| Doughton | Kerr | Richards |
| Dworshak | Kilburn | Rivers |
| Eaton | Kilday | Rizley |
| Eberharther | King | Robertson |
| Elliot | Kinzer | Robinson, Utah |
| Ellis | Kirwan | Robson, Ky. |
| Ellison, Md. | Klein | Rockwell |
| Ellsworth | Knutson | Rodgers, Pa. |
| Elmer | Kunkel | Rogers, Mass. |
| Elston, Ohio | LaFollette | Rohrbough |
| Engel, Mich. | Lambertson | Rolph |
| Fay | Landis | Rowan |
| Feighan | Lane | Russell |
| Fellows | Lanham | Sadowski |

| | | |
|----------------|---------------|------------------|
| Satterfield | Stevenson | Ward |
| Sauthoff | Stewart | Wasielewski |
| Schiffler | Stockman | Weaver |
| Schuetz | Sullivan | Weichel, Ohio |
| Schwabe | Summer, Ill. | Weiss |
| Scott | Sumners, Tex. | Welch |
| Scrivner | Sundstrom | West |
| Sheppard | Taber | Wheat |
| Simpson, Ill. | Talbot | White |
| Simpson, Pa. | Talle | Whitten |
| Slaughter | Tarver | Whittington |
| Smith, Ohio | Thomas, N. J. | Wickersham |
| Smith, W. Va. | Thomas, Tex. | Wigglesworth |
| Smith, Wis. | Thomason | Willey |
| Snyder | Tibbott | Willson |
| Sparkman | Tolan | Winter |
| Spence | Towe | Wolcott |
| Springer | Troutman | Wolfenden, Pa. |
| Stanley | Vinson, Ga. | Wolverton, N. J. |
| Starnes, Ala. | Vorys, Ohio | Woodrum, Va. |
| Steagall | Vursell | Worley |
| Stearns, N. H. | Wadsworth | Wright |
| Stefan | Walter | Zimmerman |

NAYS—0

NOT VOTING—88

| | | |
|----------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Baldwin, N. Y. | Gerlach | Monroney |
| Bates, Mass. | Gillie | Morrison, La. |
| Bell | Gore | Mott |
| Bland | Gossett | Myers |
| Bonner | Grant, Ind. | Norton |
| Boren | Hall | O'Leary |
| Boykin | Leonard W. | Priest |
| Bradley, Mich. | Harless, Ariz. | Rabaut |
| Brooks | Harness, Ind. | Reece, Tenn. |
| Buckley | Harris, Va. | Rogers, Calif. |
| Bulwinkle | Hart | Rowe |
| Celler | Hendricks | Sabath |
| Chapman | Izac | Sasser |
| Chenoweth | Jackson | Scanlon |
| Coffee | Jeffrey | Shafer |
| Costello | Johnson | Sheridan |
| Cravens | Anton J. | Short |
| Cullen | Johnson | Sikes |
| Davis | J. Leroy | Smith, Maine |
| Dawson | Jones | Smith, Va. |
| Dewey | Judd | Somers, N. Y. |
| Dies | Kee | Taylor |
| Dirksen | Kefauver | Treadway |
| Douglas | Kleberg | Vincent, Ky. |
| Dewey | Lewis, Colo. | Voorhis, Calif. |
| Durham | McLean | Wene |
| Engle, Calif. | Madden | Whelchel, Ga. |
| Fogarty | Marcantonio | Winstead |
| Forand | Martin, Iowa | Woodruff, Mich. |
| Ford | Merritt | |
| Fulmer | Morrow | |

So the bill was passed.

The Clerk announced the following pairs:

General pairs:

Mrs. Norton with Mr. Short.
 Mr. Cullen with Mr. Dirksen.
 Mr. Madden with Mr. Jones.
 Mr. Morrison of Louisiana with Mrs. Smith of Maine.
 Mr. Buckley with Mr. Harness of Indiana.
 Mr. Kleberg with Mr. Baldwin of New York.
 Mr. Costello with Mr. Grant of Indiana.
 Mr. O'Leary with Mr. Reece of Tennessee.
 Mr. Cravens with Mr. Gillie.
 Mr. Dewey with Mr. Jeffrey.
 Mr. Voorhis of California with Mr. McLean.
 Mr. Fulmer with Mr. Woodruff of Michigan.
 Mr. Kefauver with Mr. Taylor.
 Mr. Rabaut with Mr. Anton J. Johnson.
 Mr. Merritt with Mr. Rowe.
 Mr. Harris of Virginia with Mr. Douglas.
 Mr. Somers of New York with Mr. Chenoweth.
 Mr. Bland with Mr. Treadway.
 Mr. Scanlon with Mr. Morrow.
 Mr. Lewis of Colorado with Mr. Dewey.
 Mr. Chapman with Mr. J. Leroy Johnson.
 Mr. Smith of Virginia with Mr. Martin of Iowa.
 Mr. Sabath with Mr. Judd.
 Mr. Celler with Mr. Mott.
 Mr. Boykin with Mr. Bradley of Michigan.
 Mr. Hart with Mr. Gerlach.
 Mr. Priest with Mr. Leonard W. Hall.
 Mr. Izac with Mr. Bates of Massachusetts.
 Mr. Coffee with Mr. Marcantonio.

The doors were opened.

The result of the vote was announced as above recorded.

A motion to reconsider was laid on the table.

The title was amended so as to read: "A bill to increase the service-connected disability rates of compensation or pension payable to veterans of World War No. 1 and World War No. 2, and veterans entitled to wartime rates based on service on or after September 16, 1940, for service-connected disabilities, and to increase the rates for widows and children under Public Law 484, Seventy-third Congress, as amended, and to include widows and children of World War No. 2 veterans for benefits under the latter act."

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for one-half minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Mississippi?

There was no objection.

Mr. RANKIN. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi, Mr. WINSTEAD, is unavoidably absent, being away on a mission for the War Department. He desired to be paired for this bill, but since there is nobody to be paired with, as everybody is for it, I want him recorded as being in favor of the measure.

Mrs. ROGERS of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that all Members have 5 legislative days in which to extend their own remarks on the bill just passed.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentlewoman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

CALENDAR WEDNESDAY BUSINESS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the business in order on tomorrow, Calendar Wednesday, be dispensed with.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

COMMODITY CREDIT CORPORATION

Mr. COLMER, from the Committee on Rules, submitted the following privileged resolution (H. Res. 356), which was referred to the House Calendar and ordered to be printed:

Resolved, That immediately upon the adoption of this resolution it shall be in order to move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the consideration of the bill (H. R. 3477) to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisal of its assets, and for other purposes. That after general debate, which shall be confined to the bill and shall continue not to exceed 2 days, to be equally divided and controlled by the chairman and ranking minority member of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the bill shall be read for amendment under the 5-minute rule. At the conclusion of the reading of the bill for amendment, the Committee shall rise and report the same to the House with such amendments as may have been adopted and the previous question shall be considered as ordered on the bill and amendments thereto to final passage without intervening motion except one motion to recommit.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. DINGELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein a speech made by Hon. Frank Murphy, Associate Justice of the Supreme Court, on the occasion of the eighth anniversary of the establishment of the Philippine Commonwealth; and further to extend my own remarks and include therein a speech made on this occasion by my friend the President of the Philippine Commonwealth, Hon. Manuel Quezon. In both instances these speeches reflect my sentiments, Mr. Speaker.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Michigan?

There was no objection.

Mr. KEOGH. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that my colleague, the gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the Record and include therein an article by Basil J. Vlavianos entitled "The Greek United Front." The gentleman from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] is presently serving our country in the armed forces.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

AMENDMENT OF SELECTIVE TRAINING AND SERVICE ACT

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kentucky?

There was no objection.

Mr. MAY. Mr. Speaker, I have asked for this time for the simple purpose of announcing to the House that the conferees have reached a complete agreement on the bill, S. 763, relating to the drafting of pre-Pearl Harbor fathers, as an amendment to the Selective Training and Service Act. We hope to have the report and the statement ready by tomorrow, if possible. If not, on tomorrow I shall ask permission to have until midnight tomorrow for the filing of the report, and try to take the matter up the next day. I will, of course, arrange with the floor leader and the Speaker before doing anything at all about it. I have already spoken to him.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MAY. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. The conference report referred to by the gentleman from Kentucky is of such importance that I believe it should be brought up as soon as possible after it is filed.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PLUMLEY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the Record and include therein an article from the Montpelier Argus with reference to a unique association formed in Vermont entitled "Freeman's Association."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Vermont?

There was no objection.

Mr. GAVIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Pennsylvania?

There was no objection.

Mr. MILLER of Connecticut. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD on two subjects and include brief editorials with each.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Connecticut?

There was no objection.

Mr. POULSON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a resolution.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from California?

There was no objection.

Mr. HERTER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an article from today's Washington Star.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Massachusetts?

There was no objection.

Mr. COLE of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a letter I have received from the State medicine committee of the Buchanan County Medical Society, St. Joseph, Mo., informing me that on November 3, 1943, at its regular meeting the society unanimously voted and went on record as opposed to the passage of the Wagner-Murray-Dingell bills (S. 1161 and H. R. 2861) and setting out their reasons therefor.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Missouri?

There was no objection.

Mr. LARCADE. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from Louisiana [Mr. MORRISON] be permitted to extend his own remarks in the RECORD and include therein copies of four letters addressed to the citizens of Louisiana.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Louisiana?

There was no objection.

(Mr. WEISS asked and was given permission to extend his own remarks in the RECORD.)

Mr. HARRIS of Arkansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein an editorial from the Pittsburgh Press and also three telegrams.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Arkansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. FAY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my own remarks in the RECORD and include therein a

résumé of veterans' laws in effect in the State of New York.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New York?

There was no objection.

Mr. PHILBIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks in the RECORD and include two speeches I recently made.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. ROWAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Appendix and include two articles from the Chicago Sun, and a communication from Mr. Darden, of the District of Columbia.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HAGEN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD on star route legislation and include certain extracts from a book, entitled "People in Bondage."

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FERNANDEZ. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article by Ernie Pyle concerning efforts of the Mexican people in behalf of prisoners in the hands of the Japanese.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mr. GOSSETT. Mr. Speaker, I was downtown on official business and came into the Chamber just at the conclusion of the roll call on the bill increasing the veterans' compensation, just passed. If present I would have voted for the bill.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that today I be allowed to address the House for 10 minutes at the conclusion of any other special orders.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. HOLMES of Massachusetts. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a letter from the board of assessors of the town of Framingham, Mass.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that on Monday and Tuesday of next week, at the conclusion of legislative business and any other special orders, I be permitted to address the House for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE] for 15 minutes.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, my purpose today is not to add materially to the splendid arguments in opposition to the proposed subsidies outlined by the administration, for these have been pre-

sented in a scientific manner a number of times on the floor of the House by my able colleagues. I wish to present some of my own views and to give the Congress the prevailing sentiment expressed by the average small farmer in Missouri.

It is recalled by most of us that this body went on record by a nearly two-thirds vote last summer in opposition to subsidies, that just before we went home for the summer recess we extended the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation until January, and that subsidies have been in effect and we are at this time paying out of the Treasury money that is being raised through the sale of War bonds.

We will be called upon day after tomorrow to extend the life of the Commodity Credit Corporation, and the administration would have us continue the subsidies. Have we thought just how well they have worked? The only way we have to judge subsidies is by theoretically supposing that they were in operation or by actually witnessing their results. How have they been working? It was my pleasure last evening to be present at the hearing before the Senate Committee on Agriculture where farmers and packers from all over the Nation were called in to give their story. I listened to a packer testify that he received from the Government subsidy money—I believe he said \$1.10 per hundredweight—on live beef. He was required by the Government to sign an affidavit that he has passed on to the producer the entire amount of this subsidy. Now, the price on live cattle to the producer has fallen more than \$3 or \$4 per hundredweight within the last few months, yet the consumer testifies there has been no reduction in the price of meat—the finished product. The chairman of the committee, Senator SMITH, asked the audience if anybody in the crowded committee room—and it was full of farmers from all over the United States—had received any of the subsidy money. No one raised his hand. The question was asked the packer, What became of the subsidy money? He said he signed a sworn statement to the effect that he passed it on to the producer but that if the producer did not receive it, it must have been lost in the confusion. This is a concrete demonstration, Mr. Speaker, of the results of our trial-and-error methods in this country, and of the record of subsidies thus far.

Among the farmers testifying before the committee, one was a constituent of mine, an actual dirt farmer, who lives in my district. I ask unanimous consent to read to you in his own words his testimony given last night before the Senate committee, as follows:

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. SCHWABE. Mr. Speaker, that statement is as follows:

I am Theodore Anderson, of Montreal, Mo., a farmer and feeder of cattle and hogs. I am president of the American Pork Producers Association and president of the Missouri Live Stock Association. I have spent my entire life on the farm, and I normally feed 1,000 to 1,200 hogs per year. Due to continual confusion and uncertainty, I have on my farm at this time fewer hogs than at any

time in several years, and frankly, I do not know just what I am going to do the next 12 months.

The producers of hogs are proud and happy to produce so vital a food product for our armed forces, our allies, and our civilian population, and we feel that our production record is above criticism. Due to our greatly increased production of hogs, there has never been an actual shortage of pork and any indicated shortage has been due to bungling, bureaucratic mismanagement. Alternate shortages and gluts have been due to Government failure to recognize the necessity of a seasonal variation in hog prices. Hog producers want to continue their production, but it will be impossible unless a straightforward, practical program can be adopted.

We as farmers and hog producers are unalterably opposed to subsidies being used in place of a fair market price, because we believe that it is inflationary and impractical.

We farmers cannot understand why it isn't inflationary for the Government to borrow money to pay a part of the grocery bill for consumers who are enjoying the present unprecedented wage scale. Surely this is true, for every Government radio broadcast tells us how many billion dangerous inflationary dollars they have. If we allow the Government to subsidize the consumers now, what can we expect when less favorable incomes prevail? Do we want to postpone a part of their grocery bill for the boys to pay in taxation after they return from the war?

A consuming public that has money enough to pay almost any price to a black market or ridiculously high prices for articles not under price control certainly has enough money to pay their grocery bill today. The benefit of subsidies has apparently not been reflected to consumers, and certainly they have not been reflected to producers.

We believe that subsidies are employed by O. P. A. primarily to deprive hog men of the management of their own business and place us under Government controls which are likely to continue not only during, but after, the war.

These Government controls which accompany subsidies are destroying confidence of swine growers and is reducing production and unnecessarily prolonging the war. We hog men are opposed to live ceilings because they give the Washington bureaucrats and dictators the control of the entire swine industry and regiment the swine producers in an un-American manner. Ceilings will require allocation among producers and among packers.

Realizing the need for some control of prices, we believe that the proposed meat-management plan as developed by the livestock and meat industry to be the most effective plan that has been proposed.

The farmers feel that live hog ceilings are discouraging and are destroying the standard successful methods of production and system of marketing to the detriment of both producers and consumers. Live hog ceilings ignore quality, make no seasonal variation in production costs for hogs and break down production and availability of pork products throughout the year. Live hog ceilings are destroying our open competitive markets, are creating black markets, are causing unsatisfactory and unnecessary confusion in the movement of live hogs to processors.

As has been said, give the farmer a decent price for his products in the market place and there will be no necessity for subsidies. He is opposed to accepting a Government dole and forever forcing him to remain an object of charity.

Subsidy will discourage the production of food. Let the income of those who till the soil be brought in line with national income.

During the past few weeks and months I have listened carefully to arguments given by the gentleman from Texas [Mr.

PATMAN] and other advocates of the subsidy program of the administration, and it seems to me that many of these arguments are based on fallacies. It is said that for a few dollars spent for subsidies, the American people would be saved many, many times that amount in consumer costs. I wonder if that is true? It sounds very fine indeed. It is about as attractive as the argument presented in a chain letter which I received several years ago from a friend with the request that I write five similar letters to that many friends of mine and remit a dime to the sender. It all sounded very fine and I anticipated that I would receive many dimes from suckers on down the line, with the possibility, as I remember, of getting back over \$1,000 in dimes. These letters went all over the country and Americans, many of them intelligent businessmen, fell for this proposition because it offered something for nothing. Is it not true in this case of subsidies, we are again falling for a proposition that offers us something for nothing and which is doomed to failure because of the hidden or little noticed fallacy in the argument propounded?

It is also said that in processing, the larger the price received by the producer, the greater the cost to the consumer—that the cost is pyramided thus—that if eggs bringing 50 cents per dozen to the producer, after going through the dehydrating process selling for \$1, would represent a 100-percent processing cost, that eggs selling for 60 cents per dozen with a 100-percent processing cost, would result in 60 cents to the processor instead of 50 cents. Now any child of high-school age has no trouble in detecting the fallacy in this case. Of course, it can cost no more to process 60-cent eggs than it does 50-cent eggs—there is no pyramiding in this instance.

There are certain fundamentals which Americans must adhere to and put into practice if we are to avoid the pitfalls that will result from centralization in the Federal Government, usurpation of legislative and judicial prerogatives by the Executive, resulting in directives being issued by hordes of bureaucrats. Another gentleman from Texas, Judge HATTON W. SUMNERS, has called attention to the fact that we Americans, regardless of our politics, must adopt a basic philosophy of taking care of our problems locally if possible and not passing on economic, social, and political problems in ever-increasing numbers to the National Government.

During the 1920's most of us were trying to live off of returns from investments. Our neighbors were buying stocks and bonds and we were trying to do as little work and extending our efforts as little as possible. Most of us wanted to be parasites and let the other fellow make our living. We went on a spree, had a good time, but pay day came with the result many of us who could least afford it lost our life's savings. Great suffering and sacrifice took place and it seems that we should have learned the lesson that we could not get something for nothing. But during the 1930's and so far during the 1940's under

the New Deal administration, we have been doing the same thing under another name and in a different way. We have practiced the doctrine of scarcity and have tried pump priming, have tried to borrow our way to prosperity and have spent more year after year than we have taken in. Some of our crackpot economists have told us that it makes no difference how much our national debt increases, how high it soars, so long as we keep up our national income, that we need have no fear about private enterprise or our system of competition, that our capitalistic system cannot be destroyed. We cannot kill it, they say, and so we have been passing on to future generations the payment of the bills it is our duty and right to assume as we go along. The spree which we enjoyed during the 1920's is nothing compared with the grand orgy of indulgence that is taking place on a much larger scale during the past few years.

One striking difference is that it was private initiative that was on the spree before, now it is the administration. Before, it was corporate enterprise extending itself too far; now it is our duly elected Executive and his many appointees who are sanctioning the far-reaching economic experiments. Those of us who are still sober realize that pay day will again come in one form or another, and that the solution is for us to adopt a basic philosophy on the part of the individual citizen of giving value received for that which he gets and not be continually striving to get something for nothing.

Mr. Speaker, the farmers of my district are utterly opposed to subsidies even though it might appear on the surface that they will benefit from certain of them. The arguments used in debating subsidies are all in favor of the consumer, chiefly in the large cities where the electoral vote is greatest. However, I would like to make the observation right here, judging from the recent indications at the polls, that the consumers are no longer being fooled by the promise of immediate benefits. They have felt the pinch of taxes in recent months and are becoming aware of the fact that the day of reckoning is not far off.

Listen to another dirt farmer, Mr. John Brandt, of Benton County, Mo., who has farmed all his life and who is president of his county farm association:

I just want to express my opinion in regard to the recent urge on Congress by the administration.

Obviously referring to President Roosevelt's recent message.

I think this is something that should never be done, because if labor cannot pay for its food and clothing now, with such sky-high wages, when will they ever be able to pay for their food? When the deflation comes after the war? It all looks to me like plain politics to please organized labor and make them vote solidly for the New Deal next year—all at the expense of the bankrupt Federal Treasury.

The farmers would much prefer not to get subsidy payments from the bankrupt Treasury, but would much rather have farm produce prices in line with labor and the products the farmer has to buy and let labor and

others pay for their food now when they are able to do so. Where will Uncle Sam get the money to put everybody on relief or W. P. A. when the war is over?

Again, may we hear the words of the manager of a grain, feed, and millers' association, Mr. A. H. Mainershagen, as follows:

I know you are getting a lot of letters in reference to voting for the above-mentioned bill which eliminates the paying of subsidies on farm products. The majority of farmers and grain men would like to go back to the old way of doing business and not being paid subsidies for everything they raise. If all grains would be allowed to advance in comparison to the present wages that the Government is paying, subsidies would probably not be thought of. It is not good common sense to have to pay people to raise more produce. If the cost of administering the expenses of paying these subsidies would be considered, we would probably find that the administration expense connected with subsidies would be greater than the subsidy paid. It would mean additional help, more Government in business, and this is just the thing we want to get away from. I don't think it would stop inflation which has been pointed out by the economists. I feel that the Government is causing inflation by paying the unreasonable wages they pay at the munition plants. This is causing a hardship on all industry.

I hope that you will go down the line with the majority of the voters in your district and vote for House bill No. 3458.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, I congratulate the gentleman on the splendid statement that he is making. I was talking this morning with the State secretary of agriculture of the State of South Dakota, Mr. Everson. He told me that he was present at the meeting at the Senate hearing this morning on the matter of subsidies. He said that he was amazed at the unanimity of the protest of producers of the country against the Roosevelt subsidy program; that the farmers wanted the country to distinctly understand, if there are to be subsidies, they are to be consumer subsidies and not producer subsidies; that they are not asking the taxpayers to assume the cost of food subsidies in this country.

Mr. SCHWABE. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Mr. Speaker, there have been instances in the case of certain critical war materials such as copper, where the benefits of a subsidy were advantageous in the present emergency to overcome the inequities of the low- and high-cost mines. But farm subsidies are not so simple. First of all, the farmer is not a bookkeeper and does not have the time and money to employ the kind of help needed to cope with the governmental regulations, nor the gas to be traveling back and forth to Government agencies for explanation. He must be on the job from dawn to dark and the constant annoyances of bureaucratic decrees after his day's work are entirely beyond his ken or inclination. The New Deal economists who have gained their knowledge of farming from books and statistical charts with their usual inaccuracies, have no conception of the problems of

the average farmer of 180 acres. He has learned his job the hard way, through practical experience, and he speaks an entirely different language than the New Deal economic advisers.

It seems the administration does not take into account the wishes, desires, or advice of those who by experience, ability, and training are best qualified to make regulations of a particular business or industry. I remember last summer, one day one of our Congressmen from the State of Iowa, called at the office of the O. P. A. to see if he could not get some encouragement on the farm machinery outlook. Without adequate machinery, the Iowa corn crop was jeopardized. This particular Congressman was told not to worry because O. P. A. had just received word that a bountiful supply of hand hoes would be available in time for cultivation of the Iowa corn crop. One can but wonder as to the background and experience of this particular bureaucrat. He must have been one of those New York or Chicago, or 1600 Pennsylvania Avenue farmers.

Repeatedly the New Deal has attempted to regiment and regulate the farmer. During peace times, we have practiced the doctrine of scarcity and experienced the coming and going of the N. R. A., and now during time of war, comes the most grandiose of all schemes thus far advanced, to put everybody—producers, processors, and consumers—directly or indirectly, on the Government pay roll. The administration would have it appear to each of these three groups that he is being especially and particularly favored, whereas, as a matter of actual fact, the simple truth is, the Treasury of the United States, that great American Santa Claus, good old Uncle Sam, in reality our boys, who we hope will be returned some day, our children and our grandchildren, are the ones who will be holding the sack.

I had the privilege on September 2 of attending a meeting in Kansas City, Mo., of the Livestock Producers' Association of America, where some 2,000 farmers from all over the West were assembled. About a score of Congressmen and Governors were on the platform. Next to me sat Senator O'MAHONEY, of Wyoming, who received a number of telegrams during the day from Washington. One of them which was from Marvin Jones, War Food Administrator, was read to the audience; it high lighted the entire meeting in that it led those in attendance to believe that the Administration contemplated no ceilings on livestock. The livestock producers present that day felt this to be quite a note of encouragement and expressed their joy with enthusiasm. However, only 9 days thereafter, September 11, an order was dated from the O. P. A., announcing ceilings on live pork. Surely this order was in the making at least 9 days, and later on in the month of September, we learned that ceilings on live cattle also were contemplated. This is a practical example of how one agency, in this case the Food Administrator, said one thing while another, the O. P. A., actually had the authority and said another. Since then Mr. Jones has

testified before various congressional committees, but what confidence can we place in his words when he has no authority. The Fulmer bill would provide for a Federal Food Administrator with power over all agencies having to do with food and would go a long way toward correcting the existing evils.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes.

Mr. PHILLIPS. In connection with what the gentleman has just stated regarding the statements made at the meeting and subsequent announcement of policy, has the gentleman read a transcript of the meat hearings in which representatives of the O. P. A. said that the plan would not be put into effect until they had consulted with the industry, while at the same time the plan was being signed in downtown Washington?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes; I have read those hearings. I thank the gentleman for his contribution.

Those who oppose subsidies, conscientiously do so for two reasons. First, subsidies are economically unsound. Second, they tend toward paternalism. Any farmer or other producer, any processor or thoughtful consumer, realizes it is easier and less costly, to let the consumer pay his food bill, even at a slightly increased price, than to raise the money through taxation to pay consumer subsidies. A cent per pound or per dozen or per bushel more to the producer may mean the bulk of his profit; it may represent 20, 30, or 40 percent profit to him, while to the consumer it is only another cent. Then, too, there is a lot of lost motion and friction and administrative cost necessitating increased hordes of employees on the public pay roll to administer the subsidies. Mortgaging our future and pledging the earnings of future generations, involving the payment of interest, is a factor not to be overlooked. For example, if we borrow \$5,000,000,000 a year and pay it back, say, in 20 years, the interest alone would amount to as much as the principal.

Now, our consumers, according to the statement by the administration, have a greater income today per capita than ever before in our history and are plenty capable of paying their food bill. Any high-school boy or girl knows it is better business to pay for a necessity now if able to do so, rather than defer an obligation to a later date. Any businessman, any banker, will tell you not to borrow money or create an interest-bearing obligation unless absolutely necessary. How different the attitude of our New Deal administration. Where this philosophy will lead to, no one knows. We can say, however, quite positively, that to take advantage of the people in a time of war and to thrust down the throats of our Congress such an economically unsound proposal under the guise of war necessity, and to undertake to sell the people the idea of subsidies as a war measure to hold the line and avoid inflation unfits the present administration for the responsibility that is

theirs, and they should be relieved of their trust.

The second fundamental reason we oppose a system of subsidies is that they tend toward paternalism; the scheme is contrary to traditional American principles of free enterprise and our system of open competition. We have progressed for a long while operating under the fundamental laws of supply and demand, and we should go slowly and proceed with utmost caution in interfering with the best system we have ever known.

From the viewpoint of the producer, processor, and consumer, and looking at the matter objectively, as an American citizen who wishes a free country with the opportunity and the incentive for our children to produce and to advance, we cannot but oppose subsidies. Our dream is still that of Thomas Jefferson's who thought of utopia as a prosperous community of farmers, an America of free and independent people. Our farmers want to be relieved of the shackles of governmental control; they want a free and independent agriculture again, at least the cost of production, and encouragement that they will receive a fair price, so that they will have enough incentive to induce them to produce bountifully.

When will our people cease to fall for such seemingly attractive schemes? When will they quit trying to lift themselves by their own bootstraps? People would have fallen for such arguments as the administration now advances a few years ago, but now they have lost faith and confidence in our administration's leaders, with all their bureaus and handing out of directives. And so we find our citizens skeptical and very cautious this time. They are indeed slow to fall for seemingly foolproof schemes such as this subsidy proposal. There is one encouraging sign, they still have confidence in their Congress. Let us represent them truly. The only excuse for our being here is that all of the people cannot come to Washington. They are opposed to subsidies and may we not let them down; may we demonstrate by our votes that we are worthy of their confidence.

Fortunately, the farmer's contact with the laws of nature has endowed him with a sense of the true value of things and he is not so easily confused with words and formal declarations of the New Deal strategists who never for a minute overlook the political implications of a seeming gratuity to the voting consumer. He applies the principles of a problem of a wider scope to the homely principles of his early, sound moral training and the laws of supply and demand, and when they do not measure up to these fundamentals that have been tested and not found wanting, he soon rejects them as false and realizes their ultimate end will mean retracing when the going will not be so good. He is suspicious of anything that is handed him for nothing. He has long since learned that this is a cold, calculating world, and that everything given has its price, even though it may not show at the moment. They have seen

all the ducking, dodging, juggling acts of the New Deal before and are fully conscious of how they will end, in greater bureaucratic control and an even more serious raid of the Treasury which will have to be paid in the future by our servicemen who are giving their all for the freedom of the world, while here at home freedom is gradually being sucked in by a great octopus of socialistic, governmental exploitation.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes.

Mr. BENNETT of Missouri. The gentleman is quite an expert on matters of interest to agriculture, and it is obvious that he has made a profound study of this particular question of subsidies. I think I should rise to congratulate the gentleman upon the work that he is doing for the farmers of our State of Missouri.

Mr. SCHWABE. I thank the gentleman.

Mr. PHILLIPS. The gentleman has made a very fine statement on subsidies and I want to ask the gentleman if it is not his belief that without the subsidy program, that is, if we had a satisfactory handling of the Food Administration, without the subsidy program which is about to be imposed on the country, the consumer would not actually be better off.

Mr. SCHWABE. It certainly appears that way to me. At least our national debt would be less and I doubt if the consumer would notice any appreciable increase in commodity prices traceable to there being no subsidy program.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Forgetting the question of subsidies at the moment, does the gentleman believe in price control during the war?

Mr. SCHWABE. Yes, to a certain extent. For example, I believe in control of the demand by consumers of meat. This is done by the use of the red ration stamps. This would help solve the problems of livestock producers.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Of course, the law of supply and demand during war is usually disturbed by reason of the unusual demands for war purposes; that is so, is it not?

Mr. SCHWABE. Oh, surely.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Now, in the case where, and I am only trying to get information and I would like to get the gentleman's view, in the case where the demand for these food commodities or products is much larger than the supply under existing conditions, what would happen to the price level if there was not some control?

Mr. SCHWABE. It is simply a difference in the way we would like to go about it. I am sure the gentleman from Massachusetts is sincere and, of course, the Members of the minority are also sincere. We all want to produce more. That is our objective. It is simply that we disagree as to the way we should go about accomplishing our objective. If prices rise and at the same time production increases we need have no great fear of inflation.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In connection with the observation that the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. MCCORMACK] made, as long ago as 1940, in November, a bill was introduced from the minority side which would have fixed and stabilized the prices of wages and things. But the majority side would not listen to any fixing of wages at that time. They said they did not want Congress to pass on it. They were going to leave it to the President. Ever since that time the President has hiked wages, but all the time he has wanted to hold the prices of farm products down. Of course, you cannot stabilize one without stabilizing the other and make it work anyway.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I call attention of the leader of the majority side that there has been no request I know of on this side of the House for the removal of price control. Suggestion has been made in very great sincerity, but the majority side just completely ignored it, that we should have started and should now return to the program which was in effect in World War No. 1, which was inaugurated and put into effect at that time by the same party to which the majority leader belonged, which was an efficient program. I am sure the majority leader does not stand on this floor to defend inefficiency, to defend duplication, to defend the cutting down of production, and to defend mismanagement.

Mr. MCCORMACK. Does the gentleman defend the prices that existed in World War No. 1?

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Does not the gentleman feel, what the farmers want to begin with, the farmers of the Nation do not object to fair ceilings placed upon their products so long as that ceiling is not placed so low that it will interfere with the production of food that is necessary for the boys on the fronts.

Mr. SCHWABE. I believe that is in accordance with the war needs. The farmer must have sufficient price incentive to encourage adequate production of food, a vital war necessity.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. That especially applies, may I say to the gentleman from Missouri, in regard to butterfats.

Mr. SCHWABE. I think that is correct.

Mr. LANDIS. I might cite, just to give an example of what kind of price control we are up against, the case of the California pea grower who did not get enough because the ceiling was not high enough to pay for the labor to pick the peas.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield.

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will you also include several thousand acres of carrots which, thanks to the Food Administration, rotted in the ground in California. I am sure the majority leader is not defending that type of food administration.

Mr. McCORMACK. Does the gentleman accept the position of the gentleman who has just spoken in his defense of prices during World War No. 1?

Mr. PHILLIPS. Prices or administration?

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman heard the question.

Mr. PHILLIPS. I heard the question. But the gentleman from California [Mr. PHILLIPS] is speaking of the administration. You have diverted the question to prices. That was not under discussion.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman made an observation referring to the prices during World War No. 1. I am asking the question now if the gentleman approves of World War No. 1 prices at the present time?

Mr. PHILLIPS. I am very willing to discuss prices with the majority leader. I ask that they be placed on a comparable basis. That is not being done by the majority side.

Mr. McCORMACK. The gentleman has not answered the question. He brought up the prices during World War No. 1. I ask the gentleman, he having indicated or offered that as an illustration of what would be a proper condition to exist now, I ask the gentleman if he approves of World War No. 1 prices at the present time. The gentleman has not answered the question yet.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry. Mr. Speaker, I would like to know who has the floor, and what the question is.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Missouri has the floor.

Mr. McCORMACK. Everybody understands who has the floor except the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I think what the gentleman from Missouri is trying to point out is that he is not complaining about having price control. What he is objecting to is the unfairness with which it is being put into operation. That is so evident in so many ways, that we are supposed to have price control and we are supposed to have equal distribution of food. Neither one of those things is being put into operation by the present manipulations of the O. P. A. The reasons that they are not are many, and if they were put into operation it would not be possible for the man with the price to go downtown and buy himself a gallon of cream and make all the butter he wants, without any points; and yet if his wife goes to the store she has to pay 5 points for a little cottage cheese that is made out of skimmed milk. In other words, there is nobody that has stood up against the old grindstone. They are afraid to put a ceiling on beef cattle.

It is just like the situation in India. There it is supposed to be a sacred animal; but they can put a ceiling on hogs

and they will shove it right down their throats without a word on their part.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. SCHWABE. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. One thing that some of us at this time object to is this proposition of rolling back prices in order to buy the labor vote. We do not like that. We say you should allow labor to go along with the rest of us, with this agreement—I will not call it a conspiracy, as the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] last night referred to the Republican program—I will not call it a conspiracy. It is just sort of a hard and fast agreement whereby the administration raises the wages of the factory workers in return for the endorsement which the administration recently had of the C. I. O. leadership. It is just what we think looks like a raw deal.

Mr. SCHWABE. May I say to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. McCORMACK] we did a pretty good job of winning World War No. 1. The point is that we did win and now it is up to us to adopt measures that will win this one. We are all out for production which is all important today.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. SCHWABE] has expired.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to revise and extend my remarks today and those that I will make today, and to extend my remarks and include therein certain statements and excerpts.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker—

Mr. LANDIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question that I have to ask?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, let me get started first.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Will the gentleman yield for a unanimous-consent request?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; I yield for a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that I may extend my remarks in the RECORD and include a newspaper article in reply to what the gentleman is about to say.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

SUBSIDIES

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, the question of World War No. 1, was brought up and the question of prices in World War No. 1 and World War No. 2. I want to mention one commodity and compare the prices paid now as compared with the prices paid then. That one commodity goes into the cost of living of every

family. That commodity is sugar. We are taking into consideration the amount of sugar consumed in this country in 1942, compared with during the World War. We paid \$2,871,000,000 less for sugar in 1942 than we would have paid for the same quantity in World War No. 1. During the two years 1942 and 1943, presuming the consumption of sugar will continue during the last three months, as during the first three quarters, our savings on sugar alone, compared with the last World War will be \$5,871,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment please.

The amount of subsidy the President asked for, that he wanted to be used, was \$800,000,000; that is for all food programs. That would be \$6.06 per capita. The savings on sugar alone compared with the last war are \$21.75 per capita; so the question of subsidy looks as though it might be favorable to the consumer.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that particular point?

Mr. PATMAN. Let me finish on sugar.

In June, 1920, there was a recorded price on sugar by the Department of Agriculture for a family of 3 of \$69.33 per year compared with \$17.67 in 1942 and 1943. A family of 5 in June, 1920, paid \$115.55 but in 1942-43 only \$29.43; in other words we could save nearly \$6,000,000,000 in 2 years on one item, just sugar alone.

Mr. Speaker, I do not like subsidies; I do not like the word "subsidy," and people are being told it is an obnoxious word, an offensive word; but I am convinced there is no alternative for keeping down the cost of living and encouraging production except through the use of subsidies.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has made what appears to be a fair statement in respect to sugar. Will the gentleman explain—

Mr. PATMAN. Just ask the question, if you please.

Mr. KEEFE. But I have got to lay a premise in order to give the gentleman an understanding as to what I am going to ask.

Mr. PATMAN. I have the understanding; go ahead.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman explain the effect of subsidies on the price of sugar as between the price of sugar in World War No. 1 and the price of sugar today? That is the information we should like to have.

Mr. PATMAN. There are two factors which enter into it—subsidies and price control.

Mr. KEEFE. I want the gentleman to make a general statement on the part subsidies played.

Mr. PATMAN. Just give me a chance and I will.

We import four-fifths of our sugar; I believe that is conceded. Our beet- and cane-sugar producers cannot compete with this imported sugar that is produced by cheap labor down here in the

islands, and we have to pay our domestic growers a little extra bonus, or a subsidy, we will call it, of about a cent a pound. That is on just about one-fifth of the sugar that is consumed in America. That saves us a cent a pound on the other four-fifths. Just common arithmetic will show anyone that that is a big saving, a big saving. Now, if we do what you gentlemen in the minority are advocating—raise the price so as to take care of domestic sugar—we would have to raise the price to the sugar growers on the islands—people who do not need it. They are already making enormous profits. Most of those sugar plantations are owned by New York banks, by the New York "farmers." So, by advocating that we raise the price on the domestic sugar, we will at the same time have to raise the price on the imported sugar. So there is where a subsidy is directly to the benefit of the American consumer of sugar, and that is the only way on earth you can do it. If anyone can tell me any other way, I shall be happy to yield.

The other factor is price control. I do not like price control either; it is regimentation, certainly it is; but in war time we have got to accept some things we do not like, something bad oftentimes to keep from having to take something worse. Often in times of peace conditions and situations arise where these things will occur, but everyone, I presume, who has studied the question is in favor of price control. I cannot conceive of a person's saying that we should not have price control. If we have price control we are going to have a lot of regulations and rules that we do not understand, and a lot of things will be done that we do not like, and a lot of things are going to be done that should not be done, and a lot of mistakes are going to be made, because we are dealing with millions and millions of commodities and articles; that is why. We must expect these things to be done, and, by reason of that subsidy, by reason of that price control, the consumers of America on sugar alone, just that one item, will save over five and one-half billions of dollars in two years' time.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Oklahoma.

Mr. RIZLEY. Would the gentleman in his extension of remarks, put in a comparison of prices in 1918, during the second year of World War No. 1, with current prices? I notice the gentleman used the year 1920.

Mr. PATMAN. I would be delighted to do that; it will appear in the RECORD tomorrow.

SUGAR PRICE NOW AND DURING WORLD WAR NO. 1

History is the best teacher of what has happened to this country through uncontrolled prices and what may happen again if the Congress does not provide subsidies to restrain increases in the cost of living. During and following World War No. 1 prices were not controlled and as a consequence they got far out of bounds. The American people were compelled to pay

through the nose, and business institutions by the score went bankrupt. Surpluses of thousands of retailers, wholesalers, and manufacturers were sacrificed in an endeavor to shoulder the storm following the collapse of commodity prices.

I do not believe any Member of Congress will want to assume the responsibility for a similar occurrence in this war if he realizes what consumers had to pay and business had to suffer—losses of hundreds of millions because there was no control over the rapidly advancing market prices. Families had to pay unconscionable prices which cost them, conservatively figured, \$6,820,000,000 over present prices for food alone, and about \$9,792,000,000 taking cost of living into consideration in 1943. Prices were in a chaotic condition. Manufacturers, wholesalers, and retailers were completely at sea to control the situation.

Sugar, for illustration, during and immediately following World War No. 1, would jump as much as \$5 a bag of 100 pounds in a week or two, rising from less than \$7 a bag to \$28 at the refinery. The retail price of sugar leaped from around 8 cents a pound in 1918 to as much as 35 cents in 1920, almost four and a half times the 1918 prices.

To provide a background of sugar prices, the consumption in 1942 was 4,561,251 tons of 2,240 pounds, or a total of 10,217,202,240 pounds. The national average retail price in 1942 and 1943, according to the Department of Labor, was stabilized at 6.8 cents a pound.

This price compares with 9.7 cents national average in 1918; 11.3 in 1919; 19.4 in 1920. The high average price for any month in 1920 recorded by the Department of Labor was 26.7 a pound in June. The Department's records show that sugar sold for 34.6 cents in Los Angeles in July 1920 while Mr. Gerrit Vander Hooning, former president of the National Association of Retail Grocers, informed me he sold it in his store in Grand Rapids, Mich., at 35 cents. Other authority has told me this price prevailed in other States.

If the American housewives are called upon again, without subsidies as a check on rising prices, or without controlled prices, to pay such high prices for sugar alone as 35 cents a pound it will cost them \$3,576,020,784. In place of that, however, they have paid during 1942 and in 1943 an average of only 6.8 cents a pound, which would mean a cost of \$704,985,954.56, in comparison with 1920.

NEARLY SIX BILLIONS SAVED 1942-43

In other words, with unrestrained pricing and no stabilization in the first war, the people of this country would have paid out in 1942, \$2,871,034,830 more for sugar and at the same rate this year based on the 35 cents a pound. In the past 2 years, therefore, the lower prices to consumers will be \$5,871,034,830 on sugar alone because of price stabilization.

On sugar alone in 1942 it would have cost consumers three and a half times the \$800,000,000 President Roosevelt is asking in the way of subsidies to place prices of food on a stable basis to avoid price inflation of 1920. With 1943 closing there

will be even a greater saving than the \$2,871,034,830 for the reason that more sugar will be consumed as the War Food Administration has released more on a rationing basis than prevailed in 1942.

In the face of these facts and figures, what will the Congress do? Tell the American people to pay \$704,985,954.56 for sugar with a subsidy of \$800,000,000, or more than \$2,871,034,830.

COST OF SUBSIDY COMPARED WITH INCREASED PRICE

This \$800,000,000 subsidy proposal represents an average cost of \$6.06 per capita based on 132,000,000 population whereas the additional cost for sugar alone at 1920 prices of 35 cents a pound means a per capita cost of \$21.75 in comparison, or \$15.69 more per capita without price regulation should prices again skyrocket as they did from 1918 to 1920, as seems reasonable to expect in view of past experiences without regulation.

Can the country afford that kind of a drain on the pocket of the American people, especially the lower income groups who usually have the largest families and can least afford to pay this higher cost?

SUBSIDIES OR INFLATION

To demonstrate more concretely the difference between regulated prices which subsidies are intended to control and to avoid inflationary prices—which are sure to follow if conditions of the last war reappear as seems almost certain—here are some convincing facts. This table shows the per capita consumption of sugar in pounds; the average price as supplied by the Department of Labor; the per capita yearly cost from 1918 to 1920; the highest official reported cost in 1920 reported by the Department of Labor; the highest price of sugar recorded in grocery stores in some cities, compared with the stable prices which have prevailed throughout 1942-43.

| Year | Per capita consumption | Cost per pound | Yearly cost per capita | Cost per pound 1942-43 | Yearly cost per capita | Per capita saving |
|-------------------------|------------------------|----------------|------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|-------------------|
| 1918..... | 73.36 | \$0.097 | \$7.12 | \$0.068 | \$4.99 | \$2.13 |
| 1919..... | 85.43 | .113 | 9.65 | .068 | 5.81 | 3.84 |
| 1920 ¹ | 86.56 | .194 | 16.79 | .068 | 5.89 | 10.90 |
| 1920 ² | 86.56 | .267 | 23.11 | .068 | 5.89 | 17.22 |
| 1920 ³ | 86.56 | .35 | 30.30 | .068 | 5.89 | 24.41 |

¹ Highest average price in 1920 reported by Department of Labor.

² Highest price reported in June 1920 by Department of Labor.

³ Highest price reached in some cities by Department of Labor and other authorities.

To illustrate in another way the cost of sugar to families based on the varying prices which prevailed in the last war and how they compare in 1942 and 1943 with stabilized prices, I have here a table which discloses the cost to families of two to five. Those having larger families would be in proportion. Briefly stated, however, these facts stand out:

FAMILY PRICE COMPARED

A family of three in 1918 paid \$21.36 for sugar compared with \$14.97 in 1942-43, while a family of five paid out \$35.60 in the same year against \$24.95 in 1942-43.

A family of three in 1919 paid \$28.95 compared with \$17.43 in 1942-43, while a family of five paid \$83.95 in 1919, as compared with \$29.05 in 1942-43.

A family of three in 1920, at the highest average price reported by the Department of Labor, paid \$50.37 for sugar, compared with \$17.67 in 1942-43, while a family of five paid \$83.95 compared with \$29.45.

A family of three in June 1920, the highest recorded price for sugar by the Department of Labor, paid \$69.33, compared with \$17.67 in 1942-43, while a family of five paid \$115.55, compared with \$29.45 in 1942-43.

A family of three in 1920 paid, at the highest retail price reported in some cities, \$90.90, compared with \$17.67 in 1942-43, while a family of five paid \$151.50, compared with \$29.45 in 1942-43.

In 1942-43 the price of sugar remained constant at 0.068 cents a pound whereas from 1918 to 1920 the price of sugar advanced rapidly from 0.097 average in 1918 to as high as 35 cents in June 1920. The comparative cost of families of two to five between 1918-20 and 1942-43 is as follows:

| Year | Family of 2 | | Family of 3 | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| | 1918-20 | 1942-43 | 1918-20 | 1942-43 |
| 1918..... | \$14.24 | \$9.98 | \$21.36 | \$14.97 |
| 1919..... | 19.30 | 11.62 | 28.95 | 17.43 |
| 1920 ¹ | 33.58 | 11.78 | 50.37 | 17.67 |
| 1920 ² | 46.22 | 11.78 | 69.33 | 17.67 |
| 1920 ³ | 60.60 | 11.78 | 90.90 | 17.67 |

| Year | Family of 4 | | Family of 5 | |
|-------------------------|-------------|---------|-------------|---------|
| | 1918-20 | 1942-43 | 1918-20 | 1942-43 |
| 1918..... | \$28.48 | \$19.96 | \$35.60 | \$24.95 |
| 1919..... | 38.60 | 23.24 | 48.25 | 29.05 |
| 1920 ¹ | 67.16 | 25.56 | 83.95 | 29.45 |
| 1920 ² | 92.44 | 25.56 | 115.55 | 29.45 |
| 1920 ³ | 121.20 | 25.56 | 151.50 | 29.45 |

¹ Highest average price in 1920 by Department of Labor.

² Highest price reported in June 1920 by Department of Labor.

³ Highest price reported by Department of Labor in some cities and other authorities.

NEARLY \$3,000,000,000 A YEAR SAVING ON SUGAR ALONE

It should be understood the \$2,871,034,830 representing increased cost is for sugar alone. There are many other food products involved which enter into the cost of living. All of them were relatively higher during the first war and immediately thereafter than they are today.

Sugar represents but 1 percent of the average food outlay per capita—Department of Labor. The comparison of the food-cost index from 1918 to 1920, compared with 1941 to 1943 is as follows:

| | |
|----------------------|-------|
| 1918..... | 134.4 |
| 1919..... | 149.8 |
| 1920..... | 168.8 |
| 1941..... | 105.5 |
| 1942..... | 123.9 |
| 1943 (9 months)..... | 138.1 |

The total outlay for food in 1942, based on Department of Commerce figures, was \$27,600,000,000, or 21.8 percent lower than in 1919. On the basis of food costs, therefore, in 1942 there has been a saving

in price on the part of consumers due to stabilization of \$6,018,000,000.

In 1943, based on estimates of the Department of Commerce, food will cost \$31,000,000,000, predicated on 9 months' calculations. Compare the cost of food in 1920 with 1943, the increased cost is 22 percent more in 1920, hence a saving to the public, if 1920 prices were paid, of \$6,820,000,000 because of stabilization.

COST OF LIVING PRICES

The comparison of the cost-of-living index, including all commodities entering into such cost, show the following comparison:

| | |
|-----------|-------|
| 1918..... | 107.5 |
| 1919..... | 123.8 |
| 1920..... | 143.0 |
| 1941..... | 105.2 |
| 1942..... | 116.5 |
| 1943..... | 123.3 |

In 1942 the total expenditure for cost-of-living goods by the consumers of this country was \$54,400,000,000. On the basis of comparative figures in the index in 1919 with 1942, costs were 6.27 percent lower in 1942. The consumers paid, therefore, \$3,410,880,000 less for their cost of living in 1942.

In 1943 the expenditure for cost of living goods totaled \$61,200,000,000 at 16 percent less than in 1920. This represents a lower cost by \$9,792,000,000 for consumers.

These facts prove the danger of uncontrolled pricing and what stabilization means to the consumers of this country. It is not alone these added living costs which we must consider but their effect on constant demands for increased wages. We are at present witnessing this demand on the part of labor, and, as Major Bowes, of radio amateurs says, "around and around she goes; where she'll stop nobody knows." This vicious spiraling must be stopped at all costs, and since the \$800,000,000 is but \$6.06 per man, woman, and child, we can justify an action that will defeat the proposal for a subsidy in the eyes of the 132,000,000 people?

LOWER INCOME GROUPS SUFFER MOST

The greatest burden will fall on the lower income groups, the class of people who have the largest families. Here in a nutshell is what it means to them:

First. The \$2,871,034,830 lower price on sugar alone means a saving of \$21.75 per capita, \$65.25 per family of three, \$108.75 per family of five—based on 1943 cost as compared with the price of 35 cents in 1920.

Second. The saving in food of all kinds in 1943 of \$9,936,000,000 represents a per capita saving of \$75.23, \$225.69 per family of three, \$376.15 per family of five based on estimated sales of \$31,000,000,000 by the United States Department of Commerce.

Third. The saving on \$61,200,000,000 estimated by the United States Department of Commerce as total cost-of-living expenditure for 1943 of \$9,792,000,000 would make the per capita \$74.18, \$222.54 for a family of three, \$370.90 for a family of five.

Fourth. The cost per capita of \$800,000,000 subsidy requested by the Presi-

dent would represent \$6.06 per capita, \$18.18 per family of three, \$30.30 per family of five.

What the inventory losses were in the first war to measure what they could be if subsidies and price regulation are not provided to ward off another collapse of the commodity markets cannot be estimated. We do know, however, that they were in the hundreds of millions of dollars. Sugar, as previously indicated was sold by refiners at \$28 a 100-pound bag to wholesalers in June of 1920 then dropped suddenly to about \$7 per bag. We know too, that the retail price dropped from 35 cents a pound in June 1920 to 10½ cents in December 1920, an average of 8 cents in 1921, causing additional losses to retailers with surplus stocks.

SMALL BUSINESS HURT BY DEFLATION FOLLOWING INFLATION

Wholesalers, other processors, and distributors all had unusually large stocks on hand as a rule. Inventory losses ranged from a few thousand dollars, according to the size of the business, to \$200,000 for wholesale grocers. I know of one manufacturer who uses much sugar in his product who had his large warehouse full with barrels of sugar packed 5 high, each containing about 350 pounds, whose loss was over \$1,000,000. With 4,200 wholesale grocers alone it will be appreciated that at but \$20,000 average this loss totaled \$84,000,000, conservatively figured. And this does not take into consideration the many thousands of bakeries, processors, and so forth, who use much sugar in their operations.

Generally speaking, for all business, there is an accurate measuring rod to show how business failures and liabilities increased immediately following the periods of 1918-20 and 1921-23 when the commodity markets slumped so terrifically due to declines in prices of all commodities without any price control.

The total number of failures reported by Dun & Bradstreet in 1918, 1919, and 1920 was 25,314. The failures beginning with 1921, when prices started slumping the latter half of that year and ending with 1923, were 62,046. Thus we have an increase of 140 percent in the number of failures, two-thirds of which were undoubtedly due to losses suffered through shrinking commodity values.

Even more pronounced is the extent of the increase in liabilities beginning with 1921 and including 1923, which were 300 percent more than the 3 previous years of 1918 to 1920, inclusive. The losses in this latter period were \$571,434,000, compared with \$1,790,633,000 in the 3 years following the heavy price declines, or an increase of \$1,219,399,000.

There is no way of telling how much more wages will go up unless prices are stabilized. It must be obvious that they will be considerable if wages are to increase with each general increase in prices in order to meet the added cost of living. Some 60,000,000 workers are said to be employed and each dollar-a-week raise in wages would add \$3,120,000,000 a year to the pay roll.

In addition, the Government is the heaviest purchaser and would have to meet these increases. Every 1 percent increase in cost of goods of whatever nature would add 1 billion to each 100 billion spent for the war effort.

SUMMARY

Summarized, Mr. Speaker, here is the condition which confronts Congress without regulation of prices through the assistance of subsidies in certain directions to hold down the cost of living, and, of course, wages at the same time:

A. Sugar has been selling at the rate of \$2,871,000,000 lower price in 1942 and 1943 than the highest retail prices prevailing in 1920. In 2 years it has cost consumers \$5,742,000,000 less because of price stabilization.

B. If the people paid for food at the prices then prevailing in 1919 and 1920, it would have cost \$6,016,800,000 more in 1942 and \$9,792,000,000 in 1943, a total of \$15,808,800,000 for 2 years.

C. Cost of living in 1919 represented an increase of \$3,410,880,000 over 1942, while in 1943 on an estimated basis of total expenditure, the lower price would be \$9,792,000,000, making a total of \$13,202,880,000 for the 2 years if 1919 and 1920 prices prevailed during 1942 and 1943.

D. The increased failures in business caused an increase in the liabilities of \$1,219,399,000.

E. Each 1 percent increase in the cost of food over 1943 prices will add \$310,000,000 to the people of this country.

F. Every time the cost of living goes up 1 percent, the American people will have to pay \$610,000,000.

G. On each \$100,000,000,000 expended by the Government for war needs and other requirements it will have to pay out \$1,000,000,000 more.

The 132,000,000 people are this Government. Is it not good business, therefore, to subsidize, to stabilize prices by voting a subsidy of \$800,000,000 at a cost per capita of only \$6.06; \$12.12 for a family of 2; \$18.18 for a family of 3; \$24.24 for a family of 4; and \$30.30 for a family of 5, rather than submit to a probable cost based on 1920 prices of \$100.22 per capita; \$200.44 for a family of 2; \$300.66 for a family of 3; \$400.88 for a family of 4, and \$501 for a family of 5.

This does not take into consideration any increased cost to the Government for what it buys or anything else, or any wage increase.

That is our problem, Mr. Speaker. Which is the obvious way we should vote on the continuation of the Commodity Credit Corporation with respect to its continuation and the \$800,000,000 subsidy issue?

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. MURRAY of Wisconsin. I should like to have information as to whether the bill that is about to come from the gentleman's committee would prohibit the subsidizing of sugarbeets.

Mr. PATMAN. It certainly would; it certainly would. It would prevent the subsidizing of sugarbeets. And there is where you gentlemen on the Republican

side put yourselves in a very inconsistent position, if you will pardon me. I like every one of you men personally, but as a party you have your contentions, and we have ours, and, of course, we will fight it out; but I think you are making a great mistake. You are placing yourselves in the position where you are against all subsidies, except you have an exception in there as big as a mule; it is as big as a mule, and these exceptions will run not only to tens of millions of dollars a year but to a hundred million.

Mr. RIZLEY. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman indicated that all members of his party were for this program that the gentleman has outlined, but does the gentleman speak authoritatively for all the others? Does the gentleman speak authoritatively for all the members of the Texas delegation and all these other Democrats?

Mr. PATMAN. No, not any more than the gentleman speaks for all the Oklahoma Members.

Mr. RIZLEY. The gentleman said all of the party.

Mr. PATMAN. Does not the gentleman belong to that group that is fighting subsidies?

Mr. RIZLEY. Yes, and I am going to continue to fight them. I wondered if the gentleman's statement was quite accurate when he said the gentleman's own party was for the subsidy program.

Mr. PATMAN. I said it was a party question.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. For a question.

Mr. LANDIS. Is the gentleman in favor of subsidies on oil?

WILL YIELD TO ANYONE WHO CAN OFFER A PLAN EXCEPT SUBSIDIES TO HOLD DOWN COST OF LIVING AND ENCOURAGE PRODUCTION

Mr. PATMAN. I am in favor of subsidies on anything that will encourage production without increasing the cost of living. You see, we have to have some kind of standard or guide to go by. I ask the gentleman now, and I ask any person present here, if he can name any way on earth that you can hold down the cost of living and encourage production without the use of a subsidy? I yield to any person who says he has a plan.

Mr. LANDIS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman have a plan?

Mr. LANDIS. Just an example.

Mr. PATMAN. Does the gentleman have a plan that will hold down the cost of living and encourage production without using a subsidy?

Mr. LANDIS. I will give you an example in the canned-goods industry.

Mr. PATMAN. What is that example?

Mr. LANDIS. In the canned-goods industry we have in the last year paid out eight-tenths of a cent per can and we have decreased production in canned goods over 30 percent. I contend if we were to give the canning industry 1 cent per can increase, we would increase production and give the consumer the canned

goods and more canned goods at the same price or probably a cheaper price.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me say to the gentleman that he is just as wrong as he can be. I am glad he brought up canned goods. You know, canned goods are put up all over the United States. Generally, the price paid for canned goods was satisfactory and the canners could make good money. They did not need any increased price at all. The farmers were getting a good price for their production. But in certain high-priced areas, like Baltimore or Cleveland where the cost of production was so much higher, these canners were being squeezed out, they were being put out of business. Now, which is better, raise all prices up to where these few fellows could stay in business or give those few canners a subsidy? We gave them a subsidy and we are saving many dollars for every \$1 we paid out in subsidies. Does the gentleman approve of that?

Mr. LANDIS. You could do the same thing with an increase of 1 cent a can.

Mr. PATMAN. Why increase it all over the Nation just to take care of a few hardship cases? I do not care how much you hate the word "subsidy" or anything else, it does not make sense to increase the price all over the Nation to take care of a few hardship cases in various places.

COPPER

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from California.

Mr. HOLIFIELD. Is it not true that on copper a subsidy was paid to the high-cost producers? The price of copper was not raised all over the United States, but went to the high-cost producers?

Mr. PATMAN. I am glad the gentleman mentioned that. Copper is a valuable product. We had to have copper; we needed it; it is a critical material, and we had to get all the copper production we could. About three of the big copper companies, all of them, were producing all the copper. They were getting 12 cents a pound, and they were making big money. They did not need an increase, and they did not ask for it. How would you get an increase in copper production to bring in these high-cost mines where it would cost 20, 25, or 35 cents a pound to bring them in? Would you increase all prices up to them? That does not make sense. No. Just give the high-cost mines the extra price, which we did, and for every dollar we paid out that way we saved \$28. That is not only good sense, it is good business.

Mr. McMURRAY. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. McMURRAY. Is it not also true that if we had used the other method and raised this price, you would not increase the production of those efficient, effective, low-cost mines one pound of copper? In other words, they are now running at capacity?

Mr. PATMAN. Why, certainly they are.

Mr. GAVIN. Will the gentleman yield to permit an observation?

Mr. PATMAN. No. As much as I like the gentleman, I cannot yield for that purpose. I want him to get his own time.

Mr. GAVIN. Let me ask the gentleman then a question. Subsidies require money. Where are you going to get the money other than through taxes? You are looking now for \$12,000,000,000 in new money that you cannot find. The subsidy program may make another two, three, four, or five billion dollars before we get through. You are talking about the dangerous money, the inflationary trend with \$52,000,000,000 of loose money lying around. All you are doing with subsidies is passing that tax burden on to the boys who are over there fighting for us at \$50 per month. Therefore, I think the bill should be paid now and not pass this on to be paid at some later date.

Mr. PATMAN. I want to commend the gentleman for bringing up the most popular question that is usually brought up on that. I want to thank him for it. I am really indebted to him for it because it gives me an opportunity to completely answer him right here.

What is the answer? Take the copper that the gentleman mentioned. Well, we had to borrow that money. We had to borrow about \$30,000,000 to pay the subsidy on these high-cost mines. That went into the public debt and the boys coming back here after they win the war will have to pay that \$30,000,000. I know that, I concede it.

What would have been the alternative? If we had not done that, we would have had to borrow a billion dollars which the boys, after saving the country on the battle fronts of the world, would have had to pay after they come back here. Would the gentleman prefer that they pay a billion dollars or just \$30,000,000?

Mr. GAVIN. The gentleman is reciting a lot of confusing figures about which there might be a lot of argument.

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment. I am not yielding for a speech.

I assure the gentleman that the figures I am citing are correct ones, and no informed person disputes them. I can cite figures on other things that would be just as astounding as that. So the fact is that sometimes we have to take something bad to keep from taking something worse. It is better to have a \$30,000,000 debt passed on to them than to have a billion-dollar debt.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. McCORMACK. Unless we had price control, prices would now be two to two and one-half times what they are. These very soldiers they are thinking about, and properly so, when they return, we are thinking about now in connection with their wives, their mothers, and their dependents. The purchasing value of the allotments these soldiers are making and that the folks at home are receiving would be considerably less

without a price-control system than it is now under the price-control program, with all the defects that exist.

Mr. GAVIN and Mr. BUFFETT rose.

WILL HARM SERVICEMEN'S FAMILIES

Mr. PATMAN. I will not yield to anybody until I comment on that statement.

That brings up this question: We raised the allowances and allotments to the dependents of the servicemen a few days ago, and that was the right thing to do. We should have raised them. Now we come along here and propose a bill which destroys price control over the cost of living to the extent that the cost of living will go way up, and you then have taken away from them twice as much as you gave them in that increase. That is what you are doing, that is what you are proposing. What about the other people who do not come in on the increase in wages and salaries, like the preachers, the firemen in the cities, and the policemen and the teachers and the bookkeepers and the typists and the other people, including farmers, representing a large part of the middle class of our country, who have no increase in wages or prices? If you succeed in breaking this price line, you destroy the value of their wages and their salaries.

Mr. BUFFETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Nebraska is the only Member of the House who has addressed the Speaker before he began to interrupt the gentleman in the Well of the House, so the Speaker trusts that the gentleman from Texas will yield to him.

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield to him.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman has mentioned subsidies on copper. The subsidies on copper were paid only to those producers who could not produce at that level.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is right.

Mr. BUFFETT. In other words, the subsidy on copper was paid only to the people who needed it.

Mr. PATMAN. That is right, who needed it. I thoroughly agree with it.

Mr. BUFFETT. Why does not the gentleman agree with the same principle as to subsidies on food, paid only to the lower-class people who need it?

Mr. PATMAN. They need it to get production. That is what they want. They cannot produce at the prices they would get unless you give them a subsidy. It is the same way on canned goods, the same way on everything. The gentleman's question answers itself. Therefore, I presume the gentleman is not going to vote with the solid Republican minority on that.

Mr. BUFFETT. The gentleman is an adept at twisting my question around. If that is true, where are the producers that favor the subsidy proposal?

Mr. PATMAN. They are everywhere. There are a lot of producers that favor it, a lot of them. It is not just these Washington and New York farmers that are speaking the sentiments of the real farmers of the country. Some real farmers doubtless do oppose subsidies.

We have a lot of Wall Street farmers down here, and they are telling us how bad subsidies are. They are taking them all the time and have been taking them as long as we have had a Government, but you know subsidies are bad only for the farmers; they are good for the railroads; they are good for air mail; they are good for the merchant marine; they are good for inland waterways; they are good to help industries through the protective tariffs; and they are good for the magazines and newspapers up to an amount of \$100,000,000 a year; but they are terrible for the farmer. Is not that awful?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. If I get it, what the gentleman wants to do is to take this dollar which the housewife or anyone else has to purchase food, run it through the Washington bureaucrats, who shave it 10 cents or 20 or 30, whatever it may be, and then give it back to them.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman makes a point there. Who is a Washington bureaucrat?

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman has worked hand in hand with them for so long he ought to know better than I do.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman's question has provoked my curiosity. I will endeavor in my feeble way to answer it the best I can.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Brother Ickes is one of them.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman asked me who they were. I was going to name some of them—and this man Fortas.

Mr. PATMAN. I will ask the gentleman now to give me just a little time to expand on it. Who are these bureaucrats?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Is the gentleman asking me?

BUREAUCRATS

Mr. PATMAN. No; I am asking myself. I am letting the gentleman go right now, for the present. Let us take the W. P. B. Who are the people in charge in W. P. B.? I never heard of Mr. Donald Nelson being accused of being a Democrat. Maybe he is. But he is a mighty fine man, a good man, and he will emerge after this war as one of the greatest men in the war. I do not care if he happens to be a member of the other party. And who are the people in the bottleneck positions down there, heads of these boards and bureaus, that you call bureaucrats? Most of them are Republicans. Why? It is perfectly natural. It was accidental; what I mean, they were not doing it on purpose, it was the logical thing. You have got to have people down there who know all about copper, who know all about steel and aluminum and brass and all these different things. Where are you going to get them? The little business fellow does not have the time to give up his business and come to Washington and look after it. Only the big fellow, the dollar-a-year man, who has somebody right beside him who

can take his place, can run off down to Washington and stay here all the time, and kind of look after his own business at the same time, too.

So it was just a natural course to be taken, that the big fellows would drift into this. I asked down there why they did not get rid of these steel fellows, and everybody knows they are there. I asked one of the officials why they did not get rid of them. He said, "We have to have somebody here who knows all about steel, and if we would get rid of these we would have to get somebody else, and it would be about the same." And so that is the way it is, and that is why you have so many Republicans in that situation. Many more than 50 percent of those who hold key positions in W. P. B. and O. P. A. are Republicans. Now if the Republicans can make and do so much better job, I wonder why they do not do it.

CROP OF WAR MILLIONAIRES

By the way, we have one piece of legislation which can be said to be strictly Republican legislation in this Congress, and that is the tax measure. That is a perfect piece of Republican legislation, because the Republicans framed it. And they have a right to do that. They said they were going to put over that tax bill, that Ruml plan, that made the first crop of war millionaires, or if they were already millionaires, they were determined to make them bigger. But they were only 75-percent millionaires when they came out, but they have a group now of 75-percent millionaires, and they wrote that bill. That is simply the kind of legislation we can expect, and anyone who had anything to do with writing that tax bill has no right to criticize the O. P. A., the W. P. B., the bungling bureaucrats, or anybody else.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. I was quite interested in the figures that the gentleman quoted concerning the savings, as I understood it, of some \$6,000,000,000 in sugar alone. If my figures are correct, and there are 130,000,000 people in the Nation, then a savings of \$6,000,000,000 would be about \$47 per person, or about 2½ tons of sugar to a family of 5.

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I would rather not have the gentleman take up my time by going into figures. I shall put the exact figures into the RECORD, and I shall be glad to do it, on a per capita basis and the total tonnage, not only for this year, but for last year and other years.

Mr. CALVIN D. JOHNSON. And that is the figure of 2½ tons per family of five?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, I am not taking any horseback opinion on that.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Regardless of the fact that it happened that I personally voted against the Ruml plan, nevertheless, I was laboring under the delusion that the Democrats were in control of the House and are in con-

trol of the House now, and when it passed that bill.

Mr. PATMAN. Yes; but you see if one group votes solidly it has a very powerful effect, and you gentlemen get together, and there are always some Democrats that like to go along with the Republicans, and they voted for it, and in that way you have a group, and that is true in voting on the Ruml plan in both the House and the Senate. That is what happens when you have a solid bloc of votes.

Mr. McCORMACK. But notwithstanding the statement just made, that does not eliminate any minority responsibility.

Mr. PATMAN. They have the responsibility. They got together and framed it. If they had voted their individual opinions, there would be no such responsibility, but when you frame up and say, "I am going to vote with the Republican Party" regardless of merit that is where the responsibility falls.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Yes.

Mr. KEEFE. I read the gentleman's remarks made over the radio last night, in which he told of a conspiracy between the Republicans to destroy the economy of this country and cause an increase in the cost of living and thus bring about inflation.

Mr. PATMAN. I feel complimented that the gentleman took the time to read it.

Mr. KEEFE. I did, and it is very interesting and there will be comments upon it later, as one might perceive from the wires received last night from the people of this country. What I am interested in knowing is this. The gentleman is aware, of course, through reports in newspapers that there has been a request for an increase in the price of coal to about 60 cents a ton to the consumer. Does the gentleman know that?

Mr. PATMAN. Oh, not only in the price of coal but in other things.

Mr. KEEFE. I am referring to the coal. Does the gentleman contend that that prospective increase in the price of coal to the consumers is the result of a conspiracy on the part of the Republicans, or is it due to the bungling of the labor situation in this case, and the handling of the whole labor problem which has resulted in a wage increase that necessitates an increase in the price of coal.

Mr. PATMAN. Let me answer the gentleman. You see, oftentimes we cannot see the forest for the trees and we cannot see the good things we are doing because of picking out some little, insignificant something. I will admit that is a violation of the stabilization agreement, and I hate to see it very much. There are a lot of things that happen that I do not like. But should I do like that selective service board in Minnesota the other day, just throw up my hands and say, "Let the country go to the dogs. Let the country go," because something happened which I did not like? Patriotic citizens do not do that. I am not attacking that particular selective service board. All those boards that I know are

composed of good fellows. But they acted ill-advisedly there. They should have given the matter more consideration. What you mentioned there was brought about by 1 percent of the workers of this country. The coal miners have about 500,000 members, which represents 1 percent of the workers of the country. Let us assume they did wrong, which they did, and I denounce them for it. I denounced them in the speech that the gentleman read. Should we, because these little, irritating and annoying things, and things that we do not like happen, representing only a very little pinprick compared to the whole picture, just throw up our hands and say, "Just let the country go. We don't care"? I hope the gentleman is too big to do that. Knowing him as I do, and knowing the power of his logic and reasoning and consideration of these things, I do not believe he is going to let those little things throw him off.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I will be glad to yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Unfortunately, of course, I do not have the floor.

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a question. I do not yield for a speech.

Mr. KEEFE. I want to say to the gentleman I repeat the question that I asked before and the gentleman in his usual suave manner has not answered it at all. Does the gentleman contend that the proposed increase in the cost of coal which is an element of inflation is due to a conspiracy on the part of the Republican Members of this Congress, as you charged in your speech last night?

Mr. PATMAN. With reference to that particular thing, the Republicans were not responsible for it as such. But, in comparison with the harm you are about to do, this will sink into insignificance.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman concede that that harm, if it is a harm, which causes an increase in the cost of living so far as the price of coal is concerned, is a thing which the Republican Party has nothing to do with.

Mr. PATMAN. I will say to the gentleman that he is too big to talk about little things like that. When we have a national debt of over \$100,000,000,000 and 9,000,000 men under arms, with more than 2,000,000 on 55 battle fronts of the world, giving their lives to save this country, is the gentleman going to waste time talking about little things like that? I know there is a principle involved, but at the same time it is little, looking over the whole picture, and I think the gentleman in bringing it up really does the country a little disservice. I hope he will pardon me for saying that. Because it provokes other people to bring up little ticky things and minor matters and just makes them get furious and froth and foam at the mouth and cuss out the Government and everybody connected with it because some little thing happens like that. What is 60 cents on a ton of coal compared with the 9,000,000 boys in the war and the national debt of over \$100,000,000,000?

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. I yield for a question only to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. Do I understand, then, with reference to the last statement which the gentleman just made, "What does 60 cents a ton on the price of coal mean to the people in the face of 9,000,000 men in the service and the great national debt," does he apply that same philosophy to increases on the prices of all commodities that may take place from time to time?

Mr. PATMAN. No; that is just one item.

Mr. KEEFE. I am going to ask the gentleman to answer that question. You did not answer my question.

Mr. PATMAN. The gentleman is trying to raise the prices on millions of commodities, and this only involves one commodity.

Mr. KEEFE. No; the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. KEEFE] is not attempting to raise the prices of millions of commodities.

Mr. PATMAN. I will answer it to my own satisfaction. I have answered it to my own satisfaction. I am not going to yield to the gentleman any more except for a question.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has not answered the question to anybody else's satisfaction.

Mr. PATMAN. With regard to the question of fuel, that brings up a good question. I am glad the gentleman mentioned fuel.

You know the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GIFFORD] mentioned a while ago—I do not see him. I wish he were here—he mentioned about how bad subsidies are. Oftentimes things come up like that. Mr. GIFFORD comes from New England, one of the finest sections of this country—

Mr. PHILLIPS. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PATMAN. Wait just a moment, please.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Texas has expired.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 3 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Reserving the right to object—

Mr. PATMAN. Well, Mr. Speaker, I ask for the regular order.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the gentleman proceeding for 3 more minutes?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, in view of the rule that where there are other special orders following, I do object.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD and include an article appearing in the Boston Post recently.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The SPEAKER. Under previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] is recognized for 15 minutes.

THE FOOD SITUATION

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, the problem of an adequate supply of food in this country is assuming most serious proportions. We have reached a place where Congress as well as the administration must take a practical and realistic view of the food situation. We must deal with it as a part of the national program. The supply of food in this country has become a part of the international picture. We have got to realize that food is a necessary war material. Food is not only a war necessity but will also play a significant part in the writing of a peace and post-war program.

Mr. Speaker, our Nation had an all-time high production of food crops in 1942. The record of production during the past 3 years is not a thing that just happened. A kindly Providence provided rain and sunshine, but the farmers of this country did their part, and more, to produce the bountiful crops we have had in recent years. They have worked from daylight until dark, in sunshine and rain, for 70 to 80 hours a week when necessary, and the women and children have worked with them in order that crops may be produced and a supply of food provided for our civilian uses and our armed forces.

The demand for food production of this country has been tremendous. Until the last year or two there has been a carry-over or surplus of some kinds of food, but, Mr. Speaker, we are facing the year 1944 with a sharp decline in food supplies and with practically no surpluses on hand. For example, we have an under-supply of feed at the present time which in turn is bound to produce a smaller supply of beef, pork, and other meat products. Hogs and cattle right now are going to the packers unfinished, which means that an additional supply of millions of pounds of beef will not be produced. The present outlook for the dairy business is that the amount of milk and other products will not be increased in the immediate future. In fact, the milk situation can become critical in the next few months.

I want to call your attention further to the manner in which the administration has attempted to handle that problem. A few months ago administration officials decided the price of meat was too high. No showing was made that the grower of livestock was receiving exorbitant prices for his labor or production. He was not even consulted. In June a roll-back of 10 percent on the retail price of meat was ordered. The payment of a subsidy was ordered to take its place. What happened? The meat packer and processor received a subsidy of \$1.10 per hundred on livestock purchased for slaughter and at the same time cattle sold on the market at a reduction of from \$1 to \$2 per hundred. The producer, of course, did not get any subsidy; he got the roll-back in the price of his livestock of from \$1 to \$2 per hundred. About \$4,000,000 has already been paid to processors and packers.

Such action certainly did not contribute to the increase in the supply of food.

Since that time further and different rules have been promulgated whereby an attempt is made to put ceilings on live cattle, which has further confused, confounded, and complicated the situation. These rules and regulations have been worked out by individuals who have had no practical experience in the production of food, especially livestock, and who would not seek the advice of those who have had such experience. It is my opinion, from my own experience, and from the study I have made of this situation that unless this matter is corrected promptly we are going to have a dire shortage of meat within the next few months. The irony of this situation is that although we have millions of cattle in this country, there will be a shortage of beef for the reason that there is no incentive for the producer to deliver a finished product in the market.

Mr. Speaker, I mention this as one example of the short-sightedness and mismanagement in dealing with the food problem. Mr. Speaker, it should be brought to the attention of the people of this country that those who produce the food are not getting rich. They are not even receiving parity for their products, when the cost of labor is taken into consideration. Furthermore, Mr. Speaker, although we are eating about 30 percent better than before the war started we are paying the lowest share of our income for food in our history. It is only 21 percent and believed to be the lowest of any nation in the world, and let me emphasize this, Mr. Speaker, that only one-half of the 21 percent really goes to the farmer. In other words, about 11 cents of the consumer's dollar reaches the man who really produces the food.

Mr. WINTER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to my distinguished colleague from Kansas.

Mr. WINTER. The gentleman is making a very fine statement. I just wonder if he has gone into the fact of whether or not the subsidies that are being paid in the meat industry have increased production of meat on the market.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am glad the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. WINTER] has raised the question. He has always taken a deep interest in matters of interest to the farmers of this country. The payment of meat subsidies to the packers and processors has not increased production of meat on the market. The very unfortunate thing about it is this, that because of the confusion, misunderstanding, and uncertainty of the situation, livestock men are putting their cattle on the market now and have been for the past several weeks, without their being finished, and many of them are doing it at considerable financial loss. We are not getting the production of meat that we should have and we are going to find meat production lower in the near future.

Mr. WINTER. And you cannot correct that with subsidies?

Mr. REES of Kansas. You cannot correct that by subsidies. Certainly not. The livestock men are not asking for subsidies. Neither are they asking for exorbitant prices for their products.

Mr. SCHWABE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Missouri who has just made a very informative address.

Mr. SCHWABE. These subsidies have been paid for several months, which are said to be for the producers of livestock. Can the gentleman name any benefit that the producers, the farmers have derived from this system of subsidies? Can the gentleman name a single farmer who can say that he has received any subsidy himself?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I think it is generally understood, generally agreed, that the farmer did not get any subsidy. It went to the processor, to the meat packer. The farmer did get the roll-back, however.

Of course, it was suggested by those who handled the thing that this benefit would be passed on to the farmers. But immediately, because of the uncertainty of the thing, the market went down. As I said a moment ago, it went down from a dollar to \$2 per hundred pounds, and the farmer did not receive any subsidy, but took a loss of from \$1 to \$2 per hundred on his cattle.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the distinguished gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. PATMAN] last night on the radio made this statement:

So, I say first to you housewives if the price of ham goes up 10 cents a pound, thank the Republicans and their radio spokesman.

Then, within a hundred words, he said:

So, I say to you farmers, if you bring your hogs to market and get only 8 cents a pound, blame all the Republicans.

He blames the Republicans if the price to the farmers goes down; he blames the Republicans if the price of ham to the housewife goes up.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HOFFMAN. Just how are the Republicans to blame for any cause or for any situation which arises within or without O. P. A. when the majority party, the Democratic Party, of which the gentleman is a member, has had absolute control of both branches of Congress and of the Executive office for the last 10 years?

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield at that point?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Let me say to the gentleman from Michigan, I did not hear the address.

Mr. HOFFMAN. I am quoting from a copy of his address.

Mr. REES of Kansas. I did not hear the speech of the gentleman blaming the Republicans for this situation the gentleman from Michigan has just described, but I am surprised and chagrined that he would use his radio time

to blame this thing on the Republican Party; I think it is unfortunate, if such is the case.

Mr. PATMAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I am sure there must be an answer. I do not have time to yield at this point.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, I demand the regular order; the gentleman from Texas has not addressed the Chair.

The SPEAKER. The regular order is demanded. The regular order is: The gentleman from Kansas will proceed.

Mr. REES of Kansas. As soon as I have completed my statement I shall be pleased indeed to yield to the distinguished gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield further?

Mr. REES of Kansas. Not now. Let me complete my statement.

It might be well to call your attention to some figures that are practical and rather significant. The wholesale ceiling price on beef is 22 cents per pound. You know what it costs in Washington if you can get it. Eggs on the market sold by the farmers in my community last week brought 42 cents per dozen. In Washington they are 70 cents. Of course, the consumer paid more, but that money did not go to the farmer. It went for handling charges, transportation charges, and other expenses. Mr. Speaker, the problem of food supply in this country transcends the question of how much the farmer is to get for his work, although that is extremely important. The big problem is how the greatest producing Nation in the world may increase the production of all kinds of food in order, so far as possible, to meet the greatest demand ever known in history. We must face the reality more than ever that food is an essential war weapon, and that food will be one of the outstanding factors when it comes to the writing of the peace among the nations of the world. I call your attention right now, for example, to the lend-lease commitments we have made during the past few months whereby we have agreed to increase our supplies of food to the Allies. I would further call your attention to the request of the President that we share our food with the starving people of the occupied countries across the seas. The amount for food-stuffs to be sent to Europe in the next 6 months is estimated at 7,300,000 metric tons.

Mr. Speaker, we had just about the same acreage of production we had 25 years ago. It is interesting to observe, too, that our wheat and other grain production in 1917 and 1918 was almost as high as in 1942 and 1943. The demand for food was not as great as it is at this time.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. REES of Kansas. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, are there any other special orders?

Mr. PITTINGER. I intend to ask for 15 minutes.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Kansas?

There was no objection.

Mr. PATMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield now?

Mr. REES of Kansas. In just a moment; I will as soon as I complete my statement.

Mr. Speaker, there has been too much bungling, confusion, and misunderstanding with regard to the food problem in this Nation. There has been too much theory and not enough realistic, practical, common sense used in dealing with this question. The big question today is how we may increase the food supply of this country. Of course, nobody advocates the payment of premiums or exorbitant prices for doing the job.

Mr. Speaker, we are short of food. We are doing little or nothing to encourage and increase its production. The whole problem must be clarified and worked out on a practical basis whereby we may be able to secure a maximum supply of food at fair and reasonable costs. The farmers and producers of this country must be given to understand, as never before, that they have a most important part not only in the winning of the war, but in winning the peace that is to follow. They must be given a clear understanding that they shall have a reasonable award for their efforts, and have definite assurance they will not be further confused by unnecessary bungling and red tape and regulations. They must use every effort to produce and provide more and more food.

Mr. Speaker, the payment of subsidies will not do the job. Subsidies will aggravate the trouble we are seeking to remedy. Subsidies are inflationary. Subsidies will be passed on to those who are fighting our battles as well as to our children. Subsidies, if continued, will lead to economic chaos. When this war is brought to a successful conclusion, subsidies will have to be withdrawn. Then farmers will have to receive the cost of production or go into bankruptcy. Subsidies are unnecessary at the present time.

Mr. Speaker, first, the whole problem of food, its production, distribution, and controls should be placed in the hands of a war food administrator. The administrator should have final determination on all questions involving the problem. He should have the support of an advisory board composed of men who have had practical experience in dealing with the various phases of the question.

Second. Give the farmer prices that will encourage maximum production. Let him be assured he will have fair and adequate pay for his products on the basis of what he is required to pay for the things he needs to buy.

Third. Producers must be assured they shall have an adequate supply of machinery and equipment. In the distribution of manpower assure the farmers of this country agriculture will be regarded as a part of the war industry.

Fourth. Let the public recognize that it is not just a question of helping the farmer. The question we face is how to get the food we must have, and what at this late hour can be done to improve the situation. Cheaper prices on a product—beef, for instance—does not do any good, if you cannot get the beef.

Fifth. Let the people realize our food supplies are dwindling rapidly, and adopt our program accordingly.

Sixth. Stop experimenting by allowing theorists and bureaucratic administrators to bungle and confuse the situation. Administer our food program with the least controls possible. Put emphasis on the fact that the more food we produce the less control will be necessary.

Seventh. Shape our food program on the basis of making the best possible use of our productive ability. It is a food and nutrition program we need along with a farm program.

Eighth. The farmers of the Nation must be given to understand as never before, they have the cooperation and understanding of other groups engaged in the war effort—as well as the administration itself—in producing the maximum supply of food necessary for the winning of the war and for the winning of an early peace.

Mr. Speaker, I now yield to the gentleman from Texas for his question.

Mr. PATMAN. Will not the gentleman from Michigan read more of the talk that was made last night? For by doing so he will discover that the only alternative to increased prices without subsidies is lowering the price of the farmer. He was reading the other alternative; he did not read the explanation above it, I will say to the gentleman. I hope he reads it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield again to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. In answer to the gentleman from Texas I will say that I sent down this morning and had a complete transcript made of his radio address and I had intended to insert it in the RECORD.

Mr. PATMAN. I have a copy of it here if the gentleman would like it.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman got it in before I did.

Mr. PATMAN. I have it here in my hand.

Mr. HOFFMAN. But last night the gentleman said that unless we had subsidies the price to the farmer for his hogs was going down and the price of ham to the housewife was going up. If that be true, in between there must be some racketeering or profiteering, and the whole procedure of processing, transporting, and selling is in the hands of the new dealers and the O. P. A.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota, who is ever watchful to see that the rights of the citizens of this country are carefully guarded and protected.

Mr. MUNDT. It is my pleasure to have office next to the gentleman from Kansas. I know from personal observation that he is one of the most careful students of the House and one of its hardest workers. I see a light in his office late into the night. I appreciate the time and attention he has devoted to this question. But I have asked him to yield for the purpose of asking whether he does not feel that the first thing to do to get production of food products in this country is to provide for a single Government food administrator?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I thank my friend from South Dakota. I pointed that out in my statement, and I appreciate the fact that the distinguished gentleman agrees with me on this matter.

Mr. MUNDT. I might point out that on June 24, 5 months ago, the House Committee on Agriculture reported out the Fulmer bill to provide for a single Government food administrator. For 5 long months we have waited for action; 5 months of confusion, contradictions, claptrap. The time has come now for the majority leader and the majority in Congress to give this body an opportunity to vote for a wartime administrator of food.

Mr. CLEVENGER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. REES of Kansas. I yield to the gentleman from Ohio, a distinguished and active member of the Committee on Agriculture of the House.

Mr. CLEVENGER. I have advices from my district, I may say to the gentleman from Kansas, that the hog floor has been punctured to the extent of 90 cents a hundred. Practically all last week the hog floor of \$13.60 has been \$12.70 without any support from the Government. On Tuesday, Wednesday, and Thursday of last week they could sell no hogs because they were unable to take care of them at the killing centers. Does not the gentleman think that disaster is already upon the hog producer right here at the height of the movement of fall hogs?

Mr. REES of Kansas. May I say to the gentleman from Ohio it is very unfortunate that those representatives of the administration who prepared a recent order fixing prices on live animals have not had any experience at all in dealing with livestock. Not only that, but admitted at a hearing before the gentleman's great Agricultural Committee that they did not even consult with representatives of the livestock industry before they prepared and issued orders to make these adjustments in prices on cattle and other live animals.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman has expired.

PERMISSION TO ADDRESS THE HOUSE

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 15 minutes and to revise and extend my own remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER]?

There was no objection.

Mr. PITTENGER. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. REES] has

made a very constructive speech in connection with this food problem. It has been the practice when Members of Congress criticize the innumerable bureaus, administrations, departments, and agencies of the Government in connection with the domestic problems which this country is facing due to the World War to claim that they were retarding the war effort. Of course, I do not agree with that contention or that position. I feel that when we have a bureau, administrator, stabilizer, or any other man placed in a responsible position in this Government to see that our domestic economy is carried on as it properly should be, constructive criticism is the only safeguard that the American people have in that respect.

During the past few weeks I have been a severe critic of the Office of Price Administration and I take back not a single thing that I have said about the numerous mistakes that agency has made. In connection with our problem of mining coal I feel that the coal miners were in the middle, subject to politics, and that they were entitled to a wage increase. I feel that the American people would also think the same if they were properly informed. I have observed the attitude of the numerous overlapping departments and bureaus of this Government in connection with the application of the railway employees for a wage increase. It is my opinion, after a study of that subject, that that increase is justified and I want to speak today in reference to that matter.

A very serious mistake has been made by this administration in the handling of that problem. In order not to be misunderstood may I say that I have consistently supported the administration in its war effort. I have voted for every appropriation for the War Department, for the Navy Department and for the air forces and I give to those agencies of this Government the high honor of having done the greatest job that has ever been done in human history. Second to that, I say that labor and management in industry have produced the airplanes, the tanks, the guns, and the ammunition which has made it possible for our war agencies to operate. I am sorry to say that the various bureaus and domestic agencies created by this administration have failed at every turn of the road.

They have failed to appreciate the problems of the railroad workers, they have failed to appreciate the fact that there ought to be an increase in the wages of the railway employees.

May I say on this question of subsidies which has been discussed here today that roll-backs and subsidies are the greatest fakes that has ever been proposed to the American people. The monumental mistake that the administration made when it froze wages was not to freeze the prices of the products that the people buy. It has made other monumental mistakes also. It has employed men to occupy responsible positions in these different governmental agencies who were thoroughly incompetent and unable to understand the problems of the law of supply

and demand and every other economic problem presented to them.

I do not here make a blanket indictment of a lot of able men who are doing the best they can only to find that their efforts and their policies in connection with any constructive work in these different agencies are ignored or set aside or not followed. The American people will not stand for this sort of program.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. I believe the gentleman from Minnesota will admit that personally I have practically no railroad labor or coal-mine labor whatsoever in my district.

Mr. PITTENGER. I think that is correct.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. On the other hand, the gentleman and I will both admit that there are two groups of people who, like the farmer, in respect to certain commodities did not have their recompense placed up to where it should have been in line with other industries and that is what has caused the major portion of the trouble up to date.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield.

Mr. KEEFE. Those people have the final word and the final say in the formulation of the rules and regulations and addenda and appendices that have been issued to the extent of over 3,000 since the O. P. A. has been in existence. If the gentleman will direct his criticism to that group down there the criticism will be well founded, and we may properly exclude from criticism the great number of fine men in these agencies who are diligently trying to do a good job, but find themselves thwarted by a little group who sit in these positions of economists and lawyers and who have the final interpretation of the actions of these fine men.

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank the gentleman for his comment. As I pointed out a while ago, I have no desire in this criticism I am making to include a lot of fine, conscientious, able men who are in Government service and who are trying to do a good job. I am directing my comment to the bureaucrats and to that element who have tried for week after week to prevent what I think is a justifiable increase in the wages of the coal miners, and, to bring it down to date, to that group and to those men, those individuals, those bureaus, and those commissions who are now denying to the railroad employees, who have done a masterful job in the field of railway transportation, a small increase, to which in my opinion they are justly entitled.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Minnesota.

Mr. H. CARL ANDERSEN. In my opinion, there is no Member of the House who is more fair to the various groups in America, regardless of whether or not they are represented in his district, than the gentleman who is now addressing

the House, the gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. PITTENGER].

Mr. PITTENGER. I thank my colleague for that comment; but, to get back to the subject, I want to talk this afternoon about the increase in wages for the railway employees. The railway transportation industry in this country is most vital to our war effort. Railway management and railway employees have worked overtime day after day in an effort to cope with the war needs, and they have done a fine job. In my opinion, the administration has taken the wrong road in its efforts to circumvent an increase in pay for this great body of loyal Americans in this country.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. PITTENGER. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. The gentleman is referring to the turn-down by Judge Vinson?

Mr. PITTENGER. Yes.

Mr. CURTIS. Whom does Judge Vinson represent?

Mr. PITTENGER. You answer me. I would like to know.

Mr. CURTIS. He does not represent the Congress, does he?

Mr. PITTENGER. That is the trouble. We have created these different war agencies and then autocratic men are appointed and they proceed to make their own laws—they call them regulations—and to make their own decisions, in entire disregard of the wishes of the Congress.

Some time ago I introduced a bill which I wish the Members of this Congress would have an opportunity to read, providing that the Senate and the House pass a concurrent resolution or a joint resolution so that a committee of the House of Representatives and a committee of the Senate should sit in with every bureaucrat, every administrator, every stabilizer, every agency of this Government, and see how they propose to spend the money and what they propose to do, and then tell them how they think Congress will react and respond, and then report to Congress so that Congress can be advised and can act intelligently on these numerous requests for money, most of which is wasted by our domestic theorists, economists, and what not.

Mr. CURTIS. I think the record should be kept clear, however, that in most of these acts, such as the Price Control Act, the Congress delegated the power, not to the bureau, but to the Executive.

Mr. PITTENGER. That is true.

Mr. CURTIS. The so-called bureaucrats are the agents of the Executive. The Congress is not responsible for their acts.

Mr. PITTENGER. Too many people do not think this problem through. We have in our Government three branches, legislative, executive, and judicial. It is the duty of the Congress to pass laws. No Congress in history has ever responded in a world emergency like this Congress and the preceding Congress in voting wartime powers to the Executive.

The administration features of our legislation rest upon the administrators and the bureaus and the bureaucrats appointed by the executive department of the Government. Of necessity Congress cannot watch the details of that administration. That depends upon the selection of men of experience, men of intelligence, men who know the problems and who know how to work them out successfully. The gentleman's comment is very much in point in connection with this discussion as to the increase in wages for the railway employees. All of these remarks are in point also.

The wage and labor policies of the national administration have finally reached the absolute zero of justice or reason. The erratic conduct of incompetent and inexperienced administrators has become a commonplace of too many agencies of the Federal Government; the bungling of those charged with control over labor relations has always been most conspicuous in the general chaos of the Washington bureaucracy. But in the stupid and dangerous mishandling of the railway labor situation, I believe the administration has topped all its previous records of confusion and folly. In my judgment, unless there is an immediate and direct reversal of recent railway wage policies, the Congress must itself take action.

No man needs to stand here in this House and defend the railway workers of the United States. Each of us here knows the splendid record of that great body of men. The Nation knows that under handicaps greater than ever before experienced, the railway industry has transported our soldiers and our war materials in a way that is far above praise. Words are not needed when the mountains of munitions and the millions of soldiers and sailors arrive at our seaports safely and on schedule to testify to the contribution of our matchless transportation industry. And the people of the United States know well that the pillar upon which that industry rests is the skill, the devotion, and the loyalty of the one and a half million men and women enrolled in the railway service.

But the record of these railroad workers goes far beyond the period of this war emergency. In every year of peace this Nation has been dependent upon the railway industry. The fact that we are thus dependent upon the industry and its employees has put in their hands a great economic power—a power beside which that of the coal miners, or of any of our extractive or manufacturing workers seems relatively slight. I wish I could say that the agencies of the Federal Government have been as careful, as scrupulous, and as completely responsible in the exercise of their wide powers as these railway men have always been in their conduct. Every official in this Government could well afford to study the record of the great railway labor unions over the past 50 years, and especially over the past two decades. That record is a lesson in calm, sane leadership—a lesson in the careful exercise of great responsibilities.

That record justifies these railway workers and their unions, now, in expecting that they will receive at least elemental justice and fair dealing from their National Government. If any body of our citizens has earned the right to a square deal these railway men have earned that right. But today they have been so grossly abused, so grievously discriminated against, that they have been driven to make the most serious protest within their power.

When these conservative labor groups, led by the most cautious and reliable of American union officials, can decide that they have no recourse excepting to issue a call for a strike vote of their membership, then I say someone somewhere has been guilty of a blunder of the first magnitude.

What has happened? Some one of these scintillating superscientists whose unfettered imaginations incubate so many sweeping governmental orders, has decided that the well-tested methods of handling railway labor disputes should be discarded. The Railway Labor Act, passed by the Congress upon the joint request of labor and managements in 1926, has functioned well through prosperity and depression, in peace and in war. The processes of collective bargaining have carried on smoothly, under that act, through many crises that have brought disorder and havoc to other industries. For more than 18 months of war, now, that Railway Labor Act has been the reliance of the employers and the employees, and the greatest assurance of the Nation, that labor relations on the railroads would stay on an even keel. The railway workers themselves have remained patient under circumstances much harder to endure than those which have brought repeated disruption of more than one vital war-production industry.

But the national administration, unsatisfied with the widespread discord created by the general folly of its labor program, must rip up this law, must override its procedures, and must place in the hands of one man the supreme power to dictate the wages of a million and a half wage earners in this most essential industry. I say that apart from all questions of the specific merits of the railway workers' case, in this controversy, there can be no doubt that the administration has blundered fatally and beyond repair in trying to scrap the most effective labor law ever enacted by the Federal Government. There may be defects in the Railway Labor Act, but I believe I can safely say that none of the men now charged with dictatorial control of the labor policy of the Federal Government is capable of improving upon that law. Certainly no one among them has the brains, or the experience, or the capacity to stand up and say, "The Railway Labor Act is out; hereafter I am the law!"

Perhaps someone who had not kept in touch with the railway situation might think that some great mistake has been made, under the Railway Labor Act, which necessitated drastic Executive ac-

tion. Had the railway managements and the unions joined together to put into effect extravagant wages that would force rate increases? Had the unions somehow arranged to raid the railway treasury, and get away with exorbitant demands? Were the unions asking for such impossible working conditions as to threaten the actual interruption of transportation? Only some such threatening catastrophe could justify the violence of the attack made upon the railway workers.

But there was no such danger, no such collusive action, no threat of disrupted traffic or increased railway rates.

After 9 months of orderly and lawful handling of an ordinary wage request, an emergency board set up under the Railway Labor Act had decided that the nonoperating employees of the railways should be given an increase of 8 cents in their rates of pay, "to correct gross inequities and to aid in the effective prosecution of the war." The board which made that decision was composed of trained and experienced men, who were well qualified to decide. The evidence upon which they made their decision was voluminous and comprehensive—it covered every conceivable phase of the reasons for and against the wage increase. The hearings which preceded the final report of the emergency board lasted for many weeks. The report was a model of well-reasoned, conservative judgment—too conservative, perhaps, in having done much less than justice to the railway employees.

The report and recommendation of that board should have been accepted as the basis of Federal governmental policy. Instead, the "Dictator" of Economic Stabilization on the last day open for his action, interposed a flat veto on the proposed wage increase, and suggested that the emergency board reconvene to bring out such a report as he would propose. The chairman of the board quite properly, it seems to me, refused to stultify the law and the action of his board. Thereafter the Economic Stabilizer remained inactive, allowing the railway-wage situation to grow steadily more critical, until October 16. On that date, an Executive order created a new board, called a special emergency board, for which there was no warrant in the law nor in the past practices of the industry. The special board was given special instructions. It was to bring in such a report as would satisfy the "buddha of the bureaucrats"—although why the administration should have gone to the trouble of creating a new board simply to hallow the preconceptions of the Economic Stabilizer, I cannot understand.

Now we have read the report of that special board, the board apparently to end all other boards. This time, Director Vinson did not wait a month to pass on the board's report; his approval came so fast that his own press bureau must have been racing with the board to see which might get to the reporters first. It is inconceivable that the Director gave to the new report that careful consideration which would have surveyed all its

effects, before his stamp of approval was given. It seems incontestable that the board's report was known to the Director, as thoroughly as the Director's orders were known to the board. The pernicious character of the report of that special board makes it look like the combined effort of all the would-be union breakers in the national administration.

The special board robs employee Peter to pay employee Paul, and takes about \$19,000,000 a year out of the pockets of the employees reduced, which had already been granted to them by the railroads' signed agreement. The Sharfman board, in recommending 8 cents an hour increase, figured the cost at \$204,000,000 per year and held that this was not inflationary and was well within the ability of the railroads to pay without increasing costs of the services that railroads render to the country.

The special board recommends that the agreement made between the railroads and the labor organizations for 8 cents an hour with a minimum of 54 cents an hour in the industry be amended, thereby reducing large groups of skilled workers 4, 3, 2, and 1 cent per hour from the 8 cents already agreed to, and that an additional 2 cents and 1 cent per hour would be paid to a large group of lower-paid workers. Here no minimum is provided for and the lowest-paid workers would actually receive less than the 54-cent minimum agreed to by the railroads and the labor organizations. For instance, a man getting 40 cents per hour would get 50 cents per hour under the special board's award, but would receive 54 cents an hour under the agreement signed by the railroads and the labor organizations.

I certainly would not say, Mr. Speaker, that the lower-paid groups should not get 10 cents an hour and more—their wages are far substandard—and I know that the railway unions asked for a minimum of 70 cents per hour which seems not exorbitant when the steel industry minimum is at 78 cent per hour. But I do protest against the twofold evil of the new report. The American railways and the American people are dependent upon the work of the foremen and the skilled mechanics in the shops, bridge and building departments and the skilled clerical workers of the railways, as well as these lower-paid employees. Those skilled employees, as well as the lower-paid workers, are paid wages from 30 to 75 cents below what similar men are getting in other industries. Many of these foremen and mechanics and skilled accounting employees have left the railroad service for outside employment, where wages are so much higher and where overtime compensation is much more just. The decision of the special board, if the railway unions and the Government were to accept it, would accelerate the already highly dangerous shift of skilled men from our vital transportation industry.

More insidious than that, Mr. Speaker, is what seems to be the fundamental purpose of this new report. What it would do, and what it seems to have been

intended to do, is to drive a wedge between the higher skilled and the semi-skilled, lower-paid groups of employees. It is beautifully designed to cause turmoil among the railway labor unions, to disrupt the orderly and united handling of labor problems which has done so much for the railway industry and the Nation. That decision seeks to set the unions of less skilled against the unions of higher skilled men; it seeks to enter into every union and cause discord between the better paid and lower paid in every department. Its effect, if not its purpose, would be to divide the railway employees, in order that the supreme dictator of our economic universe might the better rule them all. It would have been an entirely different situation if these lower-paid employees had been granted higher rates—but not at the expense of their fellow workers.

What kind of a stabilization plan is this? According to the Special Emergency Board's report the lowest-paid employees are being paid substandard wages. Why not then correct these substandard wages without creating greater inequities among the other employees involved? This kind of inept bungling creates more strife and turmoil and tends to destroy collective bargaining on a fair and equitable basis. You can fool some of the people some of the time, but not all the time.

The railway unions have served notice upon the administration that they are not to be victimized by this elaborate scheme. I congratulate these unions, not only on their own wisdom in the protection of the rights of the railway workers, but also in having served far more wisely than do our almighty administrators, the true welfare of the people of the United States of America.

PERSONAL EXPLANATION

Mrs. NORTON. Mr. Speaker, I was unavoidably absent at the time the vote was taken on the bill (H. R. 3356) to increase compensation or pensions payable to veterans of the World War. Had I been present, I would have voted for the bill.

THE SPEAKER pro tempore. Under previous order of the House, the Chair recognizes the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. CANNON] for 20 minutes.

TAXES AND THE SALE OF BONDS TO FINANCE THE WAR

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, we are operating under an annual budget of \$104,000,000,000—\$97,000,000,000 of which is for the war. Under the tentative agreement advanced at the beginning of this war, and under the theory agreed upon by all economists, we ought to meet these obligations half from loans, and half from Government revenues. In other words, under the schedule, we ought to raise this year, in order to meet our Budget of \$104,000,000,000, \$52,000,000,000 in revenue and \$52,000,000,000 in loans.

As a matter of fact, we are raising at this time under present revenue laws \$38,000,000,000. The Ways and Means Committee next Monday will bring a bill

to the floor which is calculated to produce an additional \$2,000,000,000. The Treasury indicated a need of \$12,000,000,000 or at least a minimum of \$9,000,000,000, but the bill proposed will produce only \$2,000,000,000 additional. In other words, with the passage of this bill, the annual revenues under present conditions will amount to about \$40,000,000,000 a year. That means we are falling \$12,000,000,000 short of what we ought to raise by revenue. Accordingly in order to meet the Budget we will have to increase our loans to \$64,000,000,000.

That is a titanic task, but one easily disposed of with proper management. It is true there has been a slowing down of momentum in the sale of bonds, and some States made their quota with difficulty in the last drive. But there are vast reservoirs of capital yet untouched, and the American people are ready and anxious to buy if we can get the message over to them. It is evident that delay in completing quotas was largely the result of confusion and misunderstanding and lack of an adequate medium of salesmanship. This can be remedied and the campaign for sale of bonds organized and expedited by a simple program of appeal and education. The medium for such a program is naturally the medium utilized in every sales campaign in the country—commercial and otherwise—the newspapers. The next sales campaign, the January drive for the fourth loan is rapidly approaching, and the fifth loan campaign in June follows closely.

We should plan at once for a business-like newspaper campaign to inform the public and secure cooperation. At this stage of the war, bonds must be sold largely through newspaper advertising, the great avenue to the public interest and favor.

Mr. HOFFMAN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Michigan.

Mr. HOFFMAN. The gentleman is an expert on this question of taxation. Will the gentleman before he finishes give us his own opinion as to how much we can raise by taxation and by borrowing, and whether there is a limit.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. There is no ascertainable limit. Bank deposits today are the highest in the banking annals of the Nation. The capacity of the investing public is far in excess of the needs of the Government—even in time of war. In addition to capital already in reserve, the national income is annually adding somewhere between \$142,000,000,000 and \$147,000,000,000 to the resources of the Nation. The value of all services and commodities available for distribution aggregate only about \$80,000,000,000, leaving somewhere between sixty and seventy billion surplus funds to run riot. The more of this surplus we can neutralize in Government bonds the less danger of waste and inflation. Under the circumstances, the sale of \$64,000,000,000 worth of bonds in this country is a small matter, if we adopt the proper medium of salesmanship—if we can get the message over to the people.

Mr. KEEFE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Wisconsin.

Mr. KEEFE. The gentleman has indicated that budgetary estimates amount to \$104,000,000,000. Ninety-seven billion dollars of that is for war purposes. That \$97,000,000,000 of budgetary estimates is based on the War and Navy estimates at the time they were sent up. An examination of those estimates indicates that they involve an estimate of the cost of tanks, guns, ships, and everything else. Does the gentleman have any idea how much under those estimates the cost will be, through the medium of renegotiation? How much will the Government pay out of the total expenditure of \$97,000,000,000, when all of those contracts for that expenditure have been renegotiated?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. We have saved in actual figures up to July, something in excess of \$4,000,000,000.

Mr. KEEFE. In renegotiation?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Yes. Approximately half of that was in cash recovered and half in readjustments. Of course, as time proceeds, the amount saved by renegotiation declines, for the reason that in the beginning when contracts for the manufacture of munitions were first negotiated it was a new and untried field. Little, if any, of it had ever been manufactured before. About all we had were the blueprints, and they were largely estimates. In short, neither Government nor industry had any very definite idea as to either's methods of costs. The principal miscalculation was failure to take into consideration methods of mass production which had been developed since the last war. When actual fabrication began, much was turned out in mass production, which in former years had been laboriously machined by hand. The result was a speed and economy of production which completely scrapped original estimates and contracts. But today all such schedules and contracts have now been readjusted and rewritten. Costs are now accurately standardized, and excess profits largely reduced or eliminated. Profits from renegotiation are correspondingly small, although in the aggregate the savings through renegotiation are still a source of material savings. No manufacturer is making the profits made in previous wars. No multimillionaires are being created overnight. And if by chance more than a very reasonable profit remains after renegotiation, the tax collector gets any excess on the income-tax returns.

Mr. KEEFE. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to yield again to the gentleman.

Mr. KEEFE. Does the gentleman have any preliminary figures as to the probable amount that will be saved out of the budgetary estimate of \$97,000,000,000 expenditure for war as the result of renegotiation as applied to those expenditures to be made in the present fiscal year to which this appropriation applies?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. With the data at hand it is possible to estimate, but it is only an estimate. On the basis of the past 6 months it is to be expected that we will make material savings, but not at the rate of renegotiation of the early contracts.

Mr. KEEFE. May I ask the gentleman this further question? In the recent military deficiency bill which the House just passed there were apparently reductions in the budgetary estimates contained in that proposed bill of approximately \$950,000,000. Is the gentleman of the opinion that further savings can be effected through wiser, if I may so express it, expenditure of funds appropriated to the Army and Navy?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Not through "wiser expenditure" because the care with which this money has been expended up to this time is one of the exceptional features of this war. With the information available at the time the money could not have been more judiciously expended. There has been less unforeseen waste in this war than in any previous American war. But conditions and needs on the fronts change constantly. It is impossible to accurately foretell at the time estimates are made—many months in advance and far removed from the scene of action—just what expenditures will be required. For example, we were under the impression in the early days of the war that we would require large quotas of the smaller-sized tanks. It later developed that such tanks were wholly inadequate and we discontinued manufacturing that type.

Even in so small a matter as barbed wire estimates were widely at variance with actual needs. Estimates for barbed wire were based on the assumption that we would need huge quantities of wire in no man's land and on the front whereas the amount of barbed wire actually required is negligible. In every drive we develop new weapons and old weapons become obsolete. It is impossible to foretell in detail what the needs will be, it is possible that these unpredictable changes on the front can save some money out of the \$97,000,000,000. Perhaps \$6,000,000,000, more or less. But that is contingent. In the meantime the Budget must be met and \$64,000,000,000 in bonds must be sold to meet it. Up to this time our method of reaching the public through the press has been largely through voluntary contributions of time and space on the part of the newspapers.

We expect them to give their time and go out into their trade territory and solicit the merchants and other businessmen to make up a page for which each merchant would pay a small part and the paper makes up the deficit. It has been an imposition, not only upon newspapers but an imposition upon the merchants, and the papers find it is becoming increasingly difficult to carry out such programs. The bill (H. R. 2684) now pending in the House provides a businesslike way in which to organize the bond campaigns and pay those newspapers a reasonable amount of their actual costs, and put the bond issue before the Nation simultaneously and in an ortho-

dox, methodical manner, calculated to get results.

While it is a secondary consideration, we must appreciate the difficulties under which the newspapers labor—especially the weeklies. The metropolitan press is not so adversely affected as it is the beneficiary of the so-called institutional advertising by firms which have nothing to sell but advertise heavily to maintain goodwill and keep their names before the public. But such advertising is limited to papers published in cities with a population of 25,000 or over and does not reach the newspapers in the rest of the country comprising 52 percent of the population of the Nation. It is this 52 percent our bond campaigns must reach, and we must reach it through the country press.

War conditions handicap the country press more drastically than most any other industry. Patronage is steadily declining as the shelves of the merchants become bare. Costs of production mount steadily. Both labor and paper are harder to get.

Notwithstanding the adverse conditions under which they operate, the Government for some strange reason which has never been explained, expects them to contribute their only commodity free gratis while it pays for every other commodity and service at highest prices. In addition the Government floods the newspaper offices with heavy releases on every conceivable subject from ration regulations to appeals for increased production crowding out revenue-producing matter with no thought of compensation.

But the prime purpose of the bill is not the relief of the hard-pressed country press—as important as that problem is just at this time. The real objective of the bill is to sell \$64,000,000,000 worth of bonds in the most practical and economical way possible; to introduce elementary business methods in Government financing. It is estimated that under the provisions of this bill we can finance the needs of the Government at an average cost of fifteen one-hundredths of 1 percent of the amount realized. And handle the issue in record time.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. I am very much interested in the gentleman's bill and have studied it with some care. I agree with him that the newspapers of America have done a perfectly grand job thus far in helping publicize, not only the bond drives, but various other patriotic drives that have been necessitated by the war. I was wondering if the gentleman has made any calculations as to what, in terms of actual dollars and cents, this bill would mean to the average small publisher of a newspaper? Does the gentleman have that broken down?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. It is calculated to involve average payments of something like eight or nine hundred dollars a year to the small weekly. Of course the actual amount would depend

on circulation and prevailing rates in the area.

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Nebraska.

Mr. CURTIS. Some months ago, the Navy Department purchased space from the newspapers for cash, to conduct an enlistment campaign throughout six or seven States. I would like to ask the gentleman, Is it not true that the Treasury Department is authorized now to buy space in weekly newspapers, if they so desire?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Through the War or Navy Departments as the gentleman has indicated. The buying of space by the Government is not a new proposition. The War Department is buying space, and as the gentleman says, the Navy Department has been advertising through the newspapers. Both the English and Canadian Governments advertise in newspapers. In this respect the bill is not a departure. It is merely an authorization and a standardization of methods and practices in common and universal use by business everywhere. It is the most practical and economical method of providing funds with which to meet our war budget.

The bill meets with the approval of the newspapers. In a plebiscite taken of the newspapers recently, 2,545 newspapers favored the bill and only 115 opposed it.

It meets with the approval of the merchants and businessmen of the country who have been solicited each bond drive to contribute to the signature pages which the Government asked the editors to underwrite. Such a plan is not only an imposition on the editor who must pass the tin cup each time to the same merchants up and down Main Street, but it is unfair to these businessmen who are asked to bear the cost of advertising the drive each time while the rest of the country is unsolicited.

In my opinion the bill also meets with the approval of a majority of both Houses of Congress.

Mr. CURTIS. Is the gentleman aware that a similar bill, with certain amendments, passed the Senate a few moments ago by a vote of 35 to 27?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad to have the information. I knew the bill was under consideration in the Senate, but did not know a vote was to be taken today. The vote justifies the expectations of the friends of the bill and is a tribute to Senator BANKHEAD, who originated the bill and has advocated it with such ability. It is another of many contributions by the distinguished Senator from Alabama to the practical solution of difficult national problems.

Mr. CURTIS. It has certain restrictions. I do not know how the bill compares with the bill which the gentleman has introduced.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. The two bills were originally identical. No doubt Senator BANKHEAD's bill has been improved during its consideration in the committee and in the Senate.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The time of the gentleman from Missouri has expired.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to proceed for 5 additional minutes.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

There was no objection.

Mr. MUNDT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from South Dakota.

Mr. MUNDT. One of the fears which has been expressed concerning the bill is that it might lead to an opportunity for certain governmental agencies or parties to play favorites. I know the gentleman has been concerned about eliminating that from his legislation. I wonder if he can delineate for the House those safeguards which are in the bill to protect each and all among the publishers against any possibility of favoritism in the dissemination of this advertising.

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I am glad the gentleman has brought up that point. Any such apprehension is without foundation. The payments are distributed equally to all the newspapers of the same class. Regardless of their political affiliations or editorial policy all newspapers of the class admissible to the mails as second-class matter receive the same amount of space and could not possibly be subject to caprice, prejudice, or political pressure.

Mr. GWYNNE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. I yield to the gentleman from Iowa.

Mr. GWYNNE. Under this bill would the Government pay the regular rate charged by the particular newspaper?

Mr. CANNON of Missouri. Naturally space, requisitions, rates, and conditions would be largely standardized to conform to local requirements, circulation, and established rates within the trade area.

Mr. Speaker, the bill is the answer to one of the pressing questions of the day. Vast sums of money must be raised both during the remainder of the war and in the first days following the armistice. Let us get the job done in the quickest, fairest, most businesslike, most economical, most practicable way possible.

The Senate has passed the bill by a substantial majority. A majority of the House favor the bill. It is to be hoped that the committee will start hearings and report it out in time to permit enactment before the holidays.

LEAVE OF ABSENCE

By unanimous consent, leave of absence was granted, as follows:

To Mr. PRIEST, for 1 week, on account of serious illness of his father.

To Mr. HINSHAW, for November 17, on account of official business.

To Mr. JONES (at the request of Mr. JENKINS), indefinitely, on account of illness.

ADJOURNMENT

Mr. GORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 5 o'clock and 4 minutes p. m.) the House adjourned until tomorrow, Wednesday, November 17, 1943, at 12 o'clock noon.

COMMITTEE HEARINGS

COMMITTEE ON THE MERCHANT MARINE AND FISHERIES

The Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries will hold a public hearing on Thursday, November 18, 1943, at 10 a. m., on House Joint Resolution 182, to create the War Shipping Field Service.

COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN AFFAIRS

The Committee on Foreign Affairs will begin public hearings on Friday, November 19, 1943, at 10:30 a. m., on House Resolutions 350 and 352, providing for the establishment by the Executive of a commission to effectuate the rescue of the Jewish people of Europe.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

915. Under clause 2 of rule XXIV, a letter from the Administrator, Office of Price Administration, transmitting the sixth report of the Office of Price Administration, covering the period ended June 30, 1943 (H. Doc. No. 358), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 2 of rule XIII, reports of committees were delivered to the Clerk for printing and reference to the proper calendar, as follows:

Mr. COCHRAN: Committee on Accounts. House Resolution 355. Resolution providing additional funds for expenses of conducting studies and investigations authorized by House Resolution 30; without amendment (Rept. No. 865). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. COLMER: Committee on Rules. House Resolution 356. Resolution providing for the consideration of H. R. 3477, a bill to continue the Commodity Credit Corporation as an agency of the United States, to revise the basis of annual appraisals of its assets, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 866). Referred to the House Calendar.

Mr. DICKSTEIN: Committee on Immigration and Naturalization. H. R. 2832. A bill to amend the Nationality Act of 1940 so as to permit naturalization proceedings to be had at places other than in the office of the clerk or in open court in the case of sick or physically disabled individuals; with amendment (Rept. No. 867). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. HOBBS: Committee on the Judiciary. H. R. 3611. A bill to authorize the appointment of court reporters in the district courts of the United States, to fix their duties, to provide for their compensation, and for other purposes; with amendment (Rept. No. 868). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. O'TOOLE: Committee on the Library. House Joint Resolution 175. Joint resolution commemorating the fortieth anniversary of the first airplane flight by Wilbur and Orville Wright; without amendment (Rept. No. 869). Referred to the House Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 3 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HOFFMAN:

H. R. 3675. A bill to amend section 112 of chapter 2 of title 38 of the United States Code (Judicial Code, sec. 51); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JENNINGS:

H. R. 3676. A bill to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, as amended, for the purpose of further regulating interstate and foreign commerce in tobacco, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. KLEIN:

H. R. 3677. A bill to aid in the stabilization of the economic structure of the United States after the present war by amending the Fair Labor Standards Act to provide for the gradual reduction of the workweek to 30 hours; to the Committee on Labor.

By Mr. LUDLOW:

H. J. Res. 194. Joint resolution designating November 19, the anniversary of Lincoln's Gettysburg Address, as Dedication Day; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DISNEY:

H. J. Res. 195. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States relating to fiscal matters; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. WALTER:

H. Con. Res. 56. Concurrent resolution to express the sense of the Congress that the annual Army-Navy football game for 1943 be played at Philadelphia for the benefit of the United Service Organizations, Inc.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. O'TOOLE:

H. Res. 357. Resolution to create a select committee to be composed of five Members of the House of Representatives to investigate the liquor distilling and wholesale liquor industries in the United States and its Territories and possessions; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. KIRWAN:

H. R. 3678. A bill for the relief of Floyd E. and Lena Mae Drummond; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. McGEHEE:

H. R. 3679. A bill for the relief of Col. Anderson F. Pitts; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. PHILLIPS:

H. R. 3680. A bill granting a pension to Mrs. Minta P. Andrews; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. PETERSON of Florida:

H. R. 3681. A bill granting a pension to Margaret Haskin; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

3560. By Mr. BRYSON: Petition of Mrs. Ray W. Denning and 40 other citizens of Dowagiac, Mich., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3561. Also, petition of 350 citizens of Spencer, Ind., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absen-

teeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3562. Also, petition of 199 citizens of Clarksburg, W. Va., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3563. Also, petition of Rev. W. A. Vanzant and 40 citizens of Clifton, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3564. Also, petition of Rev. J. H. Whedbee and 97 citizens of Girdletree, Md., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3565. Also, petition of Della Noe and 100 citizens of Grand Junction, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3566. Also, petition of Bessie M. Guerhart and 133 citizens of Gilboa, Ohio, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3567. Also, petition of Georgia Craig and 97 citizens of Atwood, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3568. Also, petition of Rev. P. R. Hayden and 43 other citizens of Houlton, Maine, urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3569. Also, petition of 127 members of the First Avenue Presbyterian Church of Denver, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3570. Also, petition of 61 members of the First Baptist Church of Puyallup, Wash., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting

the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3571. Also, petition of M. V. Van Dyke and 354 other citizens of Nashville, Tenn., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3572. Also, petition of Rev. Harvey R. Nelson and 67 members of the Arvada Baptist Church, Arvada, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3573. Also, petition of Mildred Browning and 50 citizens of Hyde Park, N. Y., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3574. Also, petition of Mrs. J. Arthur Phelps and 20 other citizens of Pueblo, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3575. Also, petition of Dr. Howard P. Powell and 113 other citizens of Charlotte, N. C., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3576. Also, petition of Anna K. Sanders and 49 other citizens of McLeoth, Kans., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3577. Also, petition of 92 members of the First Methodist Church of Canon City, Colo., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3578. Also, petition of 51 members of the First Baptist Church of Erie, Pa., urging enactment of House bill 2082, a measure to reduce absenteeism, conserve manpower, and speed production of materials necessary for the winning of the war by prohibiting the manufacture, sale, or transportation of alcoholic liquors in the United States for the duration of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3579. By Mr. COCHRAN: Petition of Willard D. Hayes and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3580. Also, petition of Lee Cafferata, and 18 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3581. Also, petition of Albert Klemm, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3582. Also, petition of Henry Dawson, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3583. Also, petition of M. Johns, and 20 other St. Louis citizens, protesting against the passage of House bill 2082 which seeks to enact prohibition for the period of the war; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3584. By Mr. SCHIFFLER: Petition of Ophelia McElroy and members of a class of women in the Sunday School of the First Christian Church of Wellsburg, W. Va., urging the passage of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3585. By Mr. GRIFFITHS: Petition of sundry ministers of McConnelsville, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, which would prohibit the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until demobilization is completed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3586. Also, petition of sundry ministers of Christian Churches of Caldwell, Ohio, supporting House bill 2082, prohibiting the manufacture, sale, and transportation of all alcoholic beverages for the duration of the war and until demobilization is completed; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3587. By Mr. MOTT: Petition signed by Mrs. H. R. Martin and 17 other members of the Loyal Women's Bible Class of the First Christian Church of Dallas, Oreg., urging enactment of House bill 2082; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

3588. By Mr. STEFAN: Petition of the resolutions committee of the Nebraska Live Stock Feeders Association, Iowa Beef Producers Association, Nebraska Stock Growers Association, and Kansas Live Stock Association, declaring unalterable opposition to the continuation of the price roll-back subsidy and livestock ceiling price program, and asking that consumers of the Nation be advised that only by supporting food producers in their efforts to eliminate this unsound, economic policy which is throttling production can their hope for adequate future food supplies be insured; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 17, 1943

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. James Shera Montgomery, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord, our life and our salvation, we praise Thee that through the ages no loftier ideal has ever been given the children of men than that exemplified by the Galilean Teacher. His star is in the firmament of humanity's hopes to which the nations look with trembling appeal. Grant that in Him our thoughts and deeds may meet, cleansing us from the dross of passion and selfish interest.

Almighty God, strong men are needed, youth is falling. Help us to go forward to do our whole duty, trusting that the